3 1761 07358071 4

TOWARDS HOME RULE

Towards Home Rule

EDITED AND MOSTLY WRITTEN

BY

Ramananda Chatterjee, M.A.,

Editor of "*The Prabasi*" and "*The Modern Review.*"

Calcutta

Modern Review Office

1917

JQ
218
C5
LIBRARY
JUL 2
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

CALCUTTA :
Printed by A. C. Sarkar, at B. M. Press,
211, Cornwallis Street ;
Published by R. Chatterjee,
210-3-1, Cornwallis Street.

Foreword

This booklet consists of reprints of some papers and paragraphs published from time to time in *The Modern Review*. They have been revised, but not recast or re-written. Additions, alterations and omissions have been made, where necessary.

February, 8, 1917. R.C.

Contents

Page

Fitness for Self-rule 1
India and Democracy 49
Home Rule for India 55
Contemporary India and America on the Eve of Separation from England ... 59
Self-rule in Oriental Countries 66
Is Parliamentary Government Suited to India ?... 72
Self-government and Good Government ... 81
The Stronger and Weaker Races of India ... 82
Objections to Indian Home Rule 84
Good Government and Self-government ... 85
Democracy and the Multiplicity of Religious Sects in India 86
Alfred Russell Wallace on the Indian Crisis ... 102
The Popular Assembly in Ancient India ... 103
India's Capacity to Rule Herself 114
The Idea of Nationality Indian in Origin ... 116
Notes on Self-rule in the East 116
Indian Unity 128
Democracy in Islam 129
Political Evolution with a Vengeance... ... 130

FITNESS FOR SELF-RULE

PRACTICAL UNANIMITY AS REGARDS THE GOAL AND IDEAL.

That India should one day become self-ruling, either within or outside the British Empire, is a political ideal which was not absent from the minds of all British statesmen. Some of them have left it on record that that was in their opinion India's destiny. For instance, the Marquess of Hastings wrote in his *Private Journal* (May 17th, 1818):

"A time not very remote will arrive when England will, on sound principles of policy, wish to relinquish the domination which she has gradually and unintentionally assumed over this country, and from which she cannot at present recede. In that hour it would be the proudest boast and most delightful reflection that she had used her sovereignty towards enlightening her temporary subjects, so as to enable the native communities to walk alone in the paths of justice, and to maintain with probity towards their benefactors that commercial intercourse in which we should then find a solid interest." (P. 361-362, Panini Office Edition).

That self-government is our goal is admitted by all. Even British officials in India have in some recent utterances admitted that self-rule is the ideal towards which India should move. Among the latest is that of His Excellency Lord Chelmsford, Viceroy of India, who, in the course of his reply to the address of the Indian Association of Calcutta, said (December, 1916): "I hope some day to see India hold a position of equality among the sister nations of which the British Empire is composed." Self-government has found place among the subjects discussed approvingly by members of the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League parties. Both these representative bodies have in their latest

sessions demanded self-government. It is the declared object of the Home Rule League.

While all agree that self-rule is our goal and ideal, there are widely divergent opinions as to the time needed for the realization of this ideal. Lord Morley, the *radical* statesman, could not imagine a time when India would cease to be under personal rule. Others, gifted with a little more political imagination, place the time of the fulfilment of our hopes in the very remote future. Others, again, say that though the time is distant, it is not very distant. Some are of opinion that Indians ought at once to have some powers of control over the administration given them; while some others think that a complete scheme of self-rule should be immediately prepared, and powers should at once begin to be given to the representatives of the people in accordance with that scheme, full control over the administration, civil and military, being vested in them in the course of the next 10, or at the most, 20 years, thus taking an effective step towards the perfect nationalisation of the government within a decade or so following. Under the circumstances it may be of some use to try to understand what is implied in fitness for self-rule.

What Self-rule implies.

What is the work that a self-ruling nation does or is expected to do? Or, in other words, what is meant by managing the affairs of a country? The principal duties of a government are to defend the country from foreign aggression, to maintain peace and order within its borders by preventing or suppressing rebellion, revolution and robberies, to raise a sufficient revenue by means of taxation of various kinds, to spend this revenue in the most economical and beneficial way, to make and enforce laws, to administer justice, and to make arrangements for education and sanitation, to maintain communications throughout the country by means of waterways, roads and railways for facilitating travelling and commerce, to make the country rich by helping

and encouraging the people to develop its agriculture, industries and commerce, to help the growth and expansion of a mercantile marine for the purposes of international commerce and intercourse, to encourage the growth of its literature and fine arts, &c.

Government with Foreign and National Personnel.

These duties can never be performed satisfactorily by any foreign government. They can be so performed only where the government is national. For the foreigners, constituting a foreign government, having a duty to perform both to their own country and the subject country they govern, cannot pay undivided and single-minded attention to the welfare of the latter, and, in case of a conflict of interests between the two countries, cannot prefer those of the subject country, as it is natural for men to be more anxious for the welfare of their own country than for that of other countries.

What the British Government has and has not done.

In India, during the last century and a half, the British Government has been doing almost all the duties of a government, some energetically, some in a lukewarm manner, and some with indifference. To some duties it has not yet set its hands. For instance, there is no Indian navy, and Government has not helped or encouraged the building up of a fleet of mercantile vessels. On the contrary, it is during the British period of Indian history that the indigenous shipping and ship-building industry have declined and almost entirely disappeared. The Indian army is not manned in all its arms by Indians, there is no aerial fleet, and the commissioned officers are all non-Indians. But this is a digression.

Our Fitness in British and pre-British Periods.

Those State duties which the British Government in India performs, are performed more or less

with the help of the people of India. They were performed by Hindus and Musalmans in the age immediately preceding the British period, and in still more ancient times by Hindus and Buddhists alone. But whether Hindus, Buddhists, or Musalmans, those who managed the affairs of the country in the pre-British period were Indians. Englishmen did not come to a country of savages, but to one where the art of Government had in previous ages made great progress.

In the British period, too, Indians have, on the whole, proved their fitness for any kind of work, civil or military, which they have been allowed to do. So it cannot be said that they are totally unfit for the performance of all kinds of civil and military work.

SUBORDINATE AND INDEPENDENT DUTIES.

It may be objected, that it is in subordinate capacities that Indians have done their work and proved their capacity. That is true in the main. But in those cases also in which Indians have held independent charges, they have proved their capacity. Moreover, as they have not been given opportunities to prove their power of initiative and their fitness for independent work in most departments, logically it can only be said that in these departments neither the fitness nor the unfitness of Indians has been demonstrated. It should be borne in mind that this applies only to the British period. In the pre-British period Indians could and did do all kinds of work. Should it be said that there had been a deterioration since then, Indians alone could not be logically held responsible for such a result.

PROOF OF WORTH AND ITS RECOGNITION.

Government may say, "We would have given you high posts if you had proved your worth." But that is begging the question. How can fitness for a particular kind of work be proved unless one gets an opportunity to do that sort of work ? It is like saying, prove that you can swim and then you will

be allowed to plunge into water. Moreover, it is not true that Indians get those appointments to which their qualifications entitle them. Take the educational department. Here the rule is to appoint even raw British and Colonial graduates to the higher service to the exclusion of Indians of superior, and often tried merit.

In executive and administrative work, too, we find that men like Romesh Chunder Dutt and Krishna Govinda Gupta could not get a lieutenant-governorship or even a chief-commissionership, though it cannot be said that they were inferior in ability to the general run of those British officers who have filled these posts. There are many Deputy Collectors who can teach many Magistrates their duties. But the former always occupy a subordinate position. In the army even Indian winners of the Victoria Cross cannot hope even to be lieutenants.

There is, no doubt, a natural reluctance on the part of Englishmen to acknowledge our fitness. For if our fitness were admitted, there would be only two courses open. One would be to give us all the posts for which we were declared fit; but that would mean the exclusion of Englishmen from many lucrative careers. The other would be to declare practically that, though Indians might be fit, Englishmen, for selfish reasons, were resolved by the exercise of political power to prevent them from getting their due. But the rulers of India could not naturally make such a brutal declaration.

The following observations of the *Philippine Review* (May, 1916) may be quoted in this connection :—

Dependent peoples are always looked upon by westerners as short of qualifications; and, whatever their actual merits may be, they (their merits) are lost sight of under cover of such *advisably* prevailing belief that *they* (said people) *are short of qualifications.*

Their failures are magnified, and their successes minimized. Their failures are theirs, and their successes not theirs, and the *latter are necessarily the work of their masters.*

The mistakes of independent peoples are not mistakes to them; but the same mistakes, if made by dependent peoples even

in the *minimum* degree, are considered *mistakes in the maximum degree,* deserving the most spiteful condemnation,—the result of their alleged lack of qualifications, character or what not.

Besides, dependent peoples are not in a position to act for themselves ; for others act for them—those who, for one reason or another, in one way or another, have assumed responsibility for their tutelage—and are always discriminated against, and subject to the pleasure of their masters, whose convenience must obtain.

On the other hand, an independent people are free from outside prejudices, none cares to waste time searching for their virtues and vices, and they are *per se* considerd as fully qualified people, particularly if before and behind them big modern guns can deafeningly roar defensively and offensively.

Present-day Indian Achievement : Correlation of Capacities.

The successful management of the affairs of a country is neither so mysterious nor so intricate and complicated a matter as to be beyond the powers of Indians to tackle and master. The historian Lecky says :—

"Statesmanship is not like poetry, or some of the other forms of higher literature, which can only be brought to perfection by men endowed with extraordinary natural gifts. The art of management, whether applied to public business or to assemblies, lies strictly within the limits of education, and what is required is much less transcendental abilities than early practice, tact, courage, good temper, courtesy, and industry.

"In the immense majority of cases the function of statesmen is not creative, and its excellence lies much more in execution than in conception. In politics possible combinations are usually few, and the course that should be pursued is sufficiently obvious. It is the management of details, the necessity of surmounting difficulties, that chiefly taxes the abilities of statesmen, and those things can to a very large degree be acquired by practice."

Different kinds of genius, talent and capacity are not separate and independent entities ; they are organically connected and correlated. If a nation gives evidence of genius, talent and ability in some spheres of human activity, it is safe to presume that it possesses the power to shine in other spheres of activity, too, if only it be allowed the opportunity to do so. We shall not speak of ancient times. Even in these so-called degenerate days, the Indian is found among the world's great spiritual teachers and

thinkers, the world's great litterateurs, the world's great artists, the world's great statesmen, and the world's great captains of industry. Even under the depressing circumstances of subjection, the Indian has fought his way to the British Parliament, to the highest Councils of the Indian Empire in London and Delhi-Simla, and won the Victoria Cross by conspicuous valour in the field of battle. It will not do to say that the small number of men to whom we refer are exceptions. The biggest trees are found, not in the midst of treeless deserts, but in tracts where there are other trees only less big than themselves. Take any age in any country and you will find that the most famous poet, scientist, statesman, general, &c., were not solitary individuals, but only the greatest among great men. Shakespeare, Darwin, Gladstone, Wellington, Nelson, were not freaks of nature, but had contemporaries who were almost their equals. What is true of England or of any other country, is true of India, too. We have many men almost as gifted as those who have made a name, many probably equally gifted, and some possibly more gifted. Given the opportunity, and there is bound to be a greater manifestation of ability of a high order in all spheres of human life.

THE GETTING AND MAKING OF OPPORTUNITY.

We have used the word opportunity more than once. It may be said that nations like men make their own opportunity, nobody gives them opportunity. This is but partially true. The Negroes of America have got some opportunity and are consequently showing what stuff they are made of. In their native countries they never got the opportunity. But the objection has been raised, "Why could they not make their opportunity in their own country ? The fact that the white European ancestors of the white Americans became civilised earlier than the Negroes shows the superiority of the white men ; for the white men *made* their opportunity, the Negro had to be *given* the opportunity." It may

similarly be said to us: "Why ask for opportunity? Make your own opportunity. If obstacles are put in your way, overcome them." So we will, so far as it lies in man to mould his destiny. But may we here remind all so-called "superior" races of one fact? Human history is not limited by the few centuries of occidental ascendency. The Hindus, the Egyptians, the Chinese were civilised, they got and made their opportunity, before all or at least the majority of European races. Why could not the Europeans make their opportunity when the Egyptians made theirs? Does that fact show the inferiority of the European races? The Japanese got and made their opportunity only half a century ago. There have been ups and downs in the history of all countries. Let none arrogantly assume that they have been wholly the makers of their own destiny. Let none, also, weakly assume that they are entirely powerless to mould their present and their future. Let all who have the power give the requisite opportunity to those who need it;—the time may come for the givers of opportunity to be its seekers. Let all who seek opportunity *make* it as far as in them lies, and it does lie in them to a very great extent. Fate or destiny is not a fixed but an indefinitely elastic boundary which nations can push further and further outwards by their strength and perseverance.

Past, present and future forms of government of a country.

Some people seem to think that the present and future forms of government of a country cannot be different from the forms of government which prevailed in it in former days. This belief or fancy has no foundation in historical fact; for in every one of the countries where at present there are either constitutional monarchies or republics, there was at some period of their history absolute monarchy. But should it be taken for granted that the past forms of government of a country qualify or disqualify its people for representative government at present or

in the future, Indians would not stand utterly disqualified.

Democracy in Pre-British India.

The earliest republics known to Europeans were those of ancient Greece and Italy. In India there were republics in ancient times in regions wider in extent than Greece and Italy combined, and for a longer period of time than the entire period of duration of those old European republics. College students who read Prof. Rhys Davids' "Buddhist India" and Mr. Vincent A. Smith's "Early History of India" know this fact. In the ancient Indian monarchies there were effective checks upon the powers of kings, though these were not exactly of the kind known to Europeans as constitutional. The Sanskrit word "raja," Rhys Davids says, originally signified something like the Greek *archon* or the Roman *consul*. In his article on "Constitutional Aspects of Rituals at Hindu Coronation," published in the *Modern Review* for January, 1912, Mr. K. P. Jayaswal has shown that Hindu Kings used to be elected, or in any case their ascension to the throne required popular ratification. This view finds support from the Hindu epics, the Ramayan and the Mahabharat. In the Ramayan we know what King Dasarath did to ascertain the desire of the people as to who should be his heir-apparent, and also how the discontent of the people found expression when their favourite Ramchandra was exiled. In the Mahabharat similar evidence is found in what happened when the blind king Dhritarastra tried to make his own son Duryodhan king instead of the Pandavas, the rightful heirs. In the history of the Pal dynasty of Bengal we find the people electing a king after a revolution. In Southern India, there were the "five great assemblies which checked the autocracy of Tamil kings, and which consisted of the people, priests, astrologers, physicians, and ministers." That village communities in India were so many little republics is well-

known. This is true both of Northern and Southern India. Mr. Vincent Smith says :—

"Certain long inscriptions of Parantaka are of especial interest to the students of village institutions by reason of the full details which they give of the manner in which local affairs were administered by well-organized local committees, or panchayats, exercising their extensive administrative and judicial powers under royal sanction. It is a pity that this apparently excellent system of local self-government, really popular in origin, should have died out ages ago. Modern governments would be happier if they could command equally effective local agency." (Early History of India, 2nd Ed., p. 418.)

The Art of Government in India of the Past.

To what a pitch of efficiency the art of imperial and local government was carried in ancient India is clear from such works as Chanakya's *Arthasastra*, *Sukraniti*, &c., the epics Ramayan and Mahabharat (particularly the Santiparva of the latter), the *Samhita* of Manu and other *Samhitas* (codes), many epigraphic records such as those on which Sir Sankaran Nair wrote his article on "Village Government in Southern India" in *The Modern Review* for March, 1914, the Greek accounts of Chandra Gupta's administration, and the achievements of Emperors Asoka, Samudra Gupta, Dharmapala, &c. In the Musalman and Maratha periods there were great statesmen and administrators like Sher Shah, Akbar, Aurangzib, Shivaji and others. The statesmanship and administrative capacity of the Peshwas deserve to be better known than they are. An excellent idea of Akbar's administrative system can be had from Abul Fazl's *Ain-i-Akbari*. The revenue system of his minister Todar Mal has been followed by the British Government. Islam is democratic, and Musalman traditions favour the representative system. Before Ranjit Singh became the autocrat of the Panjab, the affairs of the Sikhs were managed according to democratic methods. The remains of ancient monuments of various descriptions, old land communications, water-ways, irrigation works, &c., bear witness to

the high civilization and civic capacity of the people and rulers of India in pre-British days.

Our history, therefore, does not disqualify us for self-rule.

Conquest, and Loss of Capacity for and Right of Self-Rule.

Englishmen generally think and many Indians also seem to hold that our unfitness for self-rule has been demonstrated once for all by the British conquest of India. They seem to ask: "If Indians are fit to manage the affairs of their own country, why were they conquered at all?" Conquest would seem, therefore, to be a justification for deprivation of self-rule. We need not here discuss historically whether British India as a whole or its major portion was conquered by the English. Let it be granted that we are a conquered people and let us examine this doctrine in the light of history.

Examples from British Empire History.

The French Canadians were conquered by the English in 1763, but the whole colony became self-governing in 1791. After that date the French Canadians revolted more than once and were defeated and conquered as often. But they continue to be self-ruling. Some seventeen years ago the Boers of South Africa were conquered, but were granted self-government almost immediately afterwards. Ireland was conquered centuries ago. But before the Union with Great Britain in 1801, Ireland had its own Parliament, and since the Union the Irish have enjoyed representation in the British Parliament in a larger proportion than their numerical strength would entitle them to. They have rebelled, attempted to rebel and used methods of violence again and again, and have been baffled in every instance. But they have not been deprived of their right of representation. And they are sure to have Home Rule at an early date. Wales is a conquered country, but enjoys parliamentary

representation and has local self-government. England was conquered by the Romans, the Angles and Saxons, the Danes and the Normans. But it is now among the freest countries in the world. Every country, in fact, which is now free and independent, was conquered at some period or other of its history. The British Colony of New Zealand has its own parliament. The aboriginal inhabitants of this colony, the Maori, now number only 50,000. But they return four members to the New Zealand parliament. This right was granted to them in 1871, immediately after their conquest by the white colonists. *The Encyclopaedia Britannica* tells us :

"They were poor marksmen, and had but little skill in laying ambuscades. During ten years of intermittent marching and fighting between 1861 and 1871 the Maori did no more than prove that they had in them the stuff to stand up against fearful odds and not always to be worsted......Even as it was, the resistance of the Maori was utterly worn out at last. After 1871 they fought no more."

Other savage people in the British Empire who enjoy self-rule are the Gilbert and Ellice Islanders. True, the Maori and these savages are small in number ; but the enjoyment by them of self-rule disproves the doctrine that conquest must involve the forfeiture of civic rights.

Examples from Foreign History.

Numerous examples may also be given from the history of countries lying outside the British Empire. America conquered the Filipinos some eighteen years ago. These half-civilized and uncivilized men have had home rule for the last decade or so, and have been promised independence or complete autonomy at an early date. *The Philippine Review* for November, 1916, writes :—

A government directly responsible to the people has just been created in accordance with the powers vested in the Philippine Legislature by the new organic act of the Philippines. Hereafter, the people will receive full account of the administration of its affairs, and no further antagonism between themselves and the officials of the government will be possible. The party in power will rule and the departmental policies of the administration will

be determined by it. The departmental secretaries will be appointed after the prevailing party has been installed in office—selected from men of that party—and their term of office will be for three years only,—the legislative term of office. Public opinion will be given due recognition hereafter. This new form of government, in the language of Speaker Osmena, will be a constant spur to their sense of duty and to their consciences as patriots.

Serbia had been autocratically governed by Turkey for centuries. With the assistance of the Christian powers of Europe and according to some provisions of the Treaty of Berlin it obtained independence in 1878, and its king and people have been managing their affairs well ever since. Such also is the history of Bulgaria. It was under Turkish rule for centuries, and became independent in 1908 with the help of some European powers. Its king and people have not displayed any incapacity to conduct their own affairs.

Conquest does not involve loss of Self-rule.

We need not multiply examples. Those which we have already cited are sufficient to show that conquest and dependence do not lead to utter loss of administrative capacity, nor do they mean or necessarily involve or justify forfeiture of civic rights. It is only right that it should be so. If some man, good or bad, armed or unarmed, defeats another man in single combat, that does not in any country mean that the former and his descendants and successors are entitled to deprive the latter and his heirs and successors of the natural right to possess, use and manage their estate, nor that they have lost the power to do so.

Contemporary History.

Let us briefly refer to contemporary history. Belgium has been a free country, for some 80 years. It has been self-governing, and has made great progress in education, industry and commerce. Germany has conquered Belgium. But England, France and Russia are not convinced that that fact would justify the extinction of Belgian independence

and liberty, nor that that fact proves the unfitness of the Belgians to govern themselves. On the contrary, the Allied Powers are rightly trying to restore liberty to Belgium. Serbia has similarly been conquered by Bulgaria and Germany. But the Allies are trying to make her free again. Poland had long been partitioned among and ruled by Germany, Russia and Austria. But during the present European war, both Russia and Germany have promised autonomy to Poland. If conquest and long subjection meant utter unfitness for self-rule, how have the Poles all at once become fit for autonomy ?

In an article in the *Commonweal*, Mr. George Bernard Shaw has observed :—

> The truth is, all nations have been conquered ; and all peoples have submitted to tyrannies which would provoke sheep or spaniels to insurrection. I know nothing in the history of India that cannot be paralleled from the histories of Europe. The Pole, whitest, handsomest, most operatically heroic of Europeans, has eaten dirt in the East as the equally romantic Irishman has in the West. Germany has given such exhibitions of helpness political disintegration accompanied by every atrocity or internecine warfare as India at her worst can never hope to surpass. If India is incapable of self-government, all nations are incapable of it ; for the evidence of history is the same everywhere.
>
> ...... there is something to be said for the stranger as a judge. In the Middle Ages, when the Italian cities had a dispute, they called in a stranger to settle it, because the stranger, as such, was impartial. And when an Indian has a dispute with another Indian and feels surer of justice with an English magistrate than with a native one, he may be just as shrewd in his preference as the mediæval Italian, knowing that indifference, even when it is contemptuous, is not a bad working substitute for conscientious impartiality. ...... But the days are past when the judge was also the lawgiver and ruler. Nations may have as many foreign judges as they like for the sake of the foreigner's impartiality ; but they must govern themselves ; and the fact that they do it so badly that no nation is at present either free or healthy or prosperous only makes it additionally absurd for any of them to pretend to do for others what it cannot do decently for itself.

India's size and her many languages, creeds, races, and castes.

Home Rule has been thought unsuitable for India, because of its being like a large continent,

where there exist many languages, creeds, races, and castes. But the Russian Empire is very extensive and is inhabited by a variety of races and religious sects, and by peoples speaking many different languages. Yet it enjoys local self-government, and a large measure of imperial self-rule. The Austro-Hungarian Empire, too, is characterized by diversity of races, sects and languages. It is a constitutional monarchy and the form of government is largely representative. The United States of America is a republic populated by various races, speaking different tongues and having different creeds. The number of languages, as distinguished from dialects or local patois, spoken in India, has been exaggerated. In the census of 1901 they were stated to number 147 ; by 1911 they had increased to 220 ! In real fact one or other of a dozen principal languages would be found to be understood, whatever the province that might be chosen to test this statement. Besides, whatever force the multiplicity of Indian languages might be supposed to have against the exercise of self-rule by India as a whole in pan-Indian affairs, it can have none whatever against our enjoyment of provincial autonomy. In the United Provinces, Maharastra, Behar, Orissa, Bengal, Andhra, Gujarat, Sindh, &c., the people of the province all understand one main language. As for our many sects and creeds, the people of India professing them are, to say the least, really not more intolerant of one another's beliefs and practices than the Christian sects inhabiting any Western country.

Despotism and the Orient.

It is sometimes observed that as orientals have always been used to despotic government, they appreciate only autocracy ; they can neither appreciate nor are fit for self-rule. In the first place, it is not a fact that despotism has been the prevailing form of government in oriental countries in all ages. We have already given some idea of the different kinds of government which prevailed in India of the past,—

which were more or less democratic in character. It would not, however, have mattered much, if we had been accustomed only to absolutism in the past. Western peoples who now have republics or limited monarchies in their country had been at some time or other of their history governed despotically. As for oriental countries, Japan has had representative government for the last fifty years, growing very powerful and prosperous in consequence. China, though not out of the woods yet, is a republic. The insurrections caused by the attempt to convert it into a monarchy show how deep-rooted and wide-spread the republican feeling is in China. Even under Manchu rule and earlier still, the Chinese had always enjoyed a large measure of local autonomy. A constitutional monarchy, with a parliament, has been established in Persia also ; but the conflicting interests and intrigues of some European powers have prevented the Persians from showing their capacity for self-rule. Self-rule in Afghanistan will be dealt with in another article in this booklet. The success of Japan alone, however, demonstrates that oriental peoples may be capable of self-government.

SELF-RULE IN THE INDIAN STATES.

In the Indian States, known as the Native States, the Rulers, the principal officers and the subordinate officials are Indians. Mysore, Baroda, Gwalior, Travancore, and several small states are on the whole as efficiently governed as British India. Some of them are superior to British India in material prosperity, in education, in the encouragement of industrial development, and in respect of the separation of the judicial from the executive functions. No doubt, the British Government has helped the Indian States by guaranteeing protection from external aggression and prevention of internal revolts, and occasional advice given by political residents. But the people of British India, too, do not demand the immediate severance of the Indo-British connection ; Home Rule under the protection and guidance of the

British Empire is the demand of Congress and Moslem League alike.

Geographically and ethnologically Nepal is a part of India. Nepal manages its own affairs without British protection and guidance. It is true that neither the Feudatory States of India nor Nepal can hold their own against a leading European power. But Belgium, Serbia, Rumania and Montenegro have not been able to defend themselves against the Teutonic powers. The Teutonic powers could conquer Denmark and Holland also, if they liked. Do the British, the French and their allies for that reason call in question the capacity and the right of the Belgians, the Rumanians, the Serbians and the Montenegrins or of Holland and Denmark, to govern themselves ? Or would it be right to do so ?

The objection may be urged that the power to manage the affairs of the *small* Indian states is not a proof of the capacity to administer the affairs of a *large* Empire like India. Our reply is threefold :

(1) If our capacity to govern the small Native States be admitted, why cannot we in British India, leaving imperial politics alone, have self-rule in the provinces, or in the Divisions or in the Districts, or even in all the municipalities ? The peoples' hands are tied even in village unions.

(2) In the second place, the Colonials in some of the British Colonies have to deal with small areas or small populations. Their success in managing their affairs has been considered a sufficient proof of their capacity to lead some British Cabinet Ministers in recent months to promise that when the war is over, they should share in the government of the Empire. Lord Chelmsford, a former governor of New South Wales and Queensland, and a London County Councillor, has been thought fit to be appointed Viceroy of India. Why cannot then the successful work of the great ministers of the Native States, like Salar Jang, Seshadri Iyer, Dinkar Rao, Romesh Dutt, &c., be taken as a proof of Indian capacity to deal with imperial politics ?

2

Some of the independent European countries, too, are small, yet nobody questions their right and capacity to govern themselves. The following tables will afford a basis for comparison between some of our states, some British colonies and some European countries.

Indian States	Area in sq. miles	Population
Gwalior	25,107	30,93,082
Travancore	7,129	34,28,975
Baroda	8,182	20,32,798
Mysore	29,459	58,06,193
Hyderabad	82,698	1,33,74,676
British Colonies		
Newfoundland	40,000	2,40,000
New Zealand	1,05,000	10,90,000
New South Wales	3,10,400	16,50,000
Victoria	88,000	13,15,551
Queensland	6,70,500	6,06,000
European Countries		
Belgium	11,373	75,71,387
Denmark	15,582	27,75,076
Holland	12,582	62,12,701
Switzerland	15,976	38,31,220
Montenegro	5,603	5,16,000
Serbia	18,650	29,11,001

We could have given the figures for the South American republics like Chile, Argentine Republic, &c., also, but it is unnecessary.

(3) The ability to manage the affairs of a small state is really as great a test of statemanship as the ability to run a bigger one. In support of our assertion we subjoin what Max Muller wrote in the *Fortnightly Review* about Gaurisankar Udaysankar Oza, the Prime Minister of Bhavnagar.

"These words contain a rapid survey of the work of a whole life, and if we were to enter here into the details of what was actually achieved by this native statesman, we shall find that few Prime Ministers even of the greatest states in Europe had so many tasks on their hands, and performed them so boldly and so well. The clock on the tower of the Houses of Parliament strikes louder than the repeater in our waistcoat pocket, but the

machinery, the wheels within wheels, and particularly the spring, have all the same tasks to perform as in Big Ben himself. Even men like Disraeli or Gladstone, if placed in the position of these native statesmen, could hardly have been more successful in grappling with the difficulties of a new State, with rebellious subjects, envious neighbours, a weak sovereign, and an all-powerful suzerain, to say nothing of court intrigues, religious squabbles, and corrupt officials. We are too much given to measure the capacity of ministers and statesmen by the magnitude of the results which they achieve with the immense forces placed at their disposal. But most of them are very ordinary mortals, and it is not too much to say that for making a successful marriage-settlement an ordinary solicitor stands often in need of the same vigilance, the same knowledge of men and women, the same tact, and the same determination or bluff which Bismarck displayed in making the treaty of Prague or of Frankfurt. Nay, there are mistakes made by the greatest statesmen in history which, if made by our solicitor, would lead to instant dismissal. If Bismarck made Germany, Gaurisankar made Bhavnagar. The two achievements are so different that even to compare them seems absurd, but the methods to be followed in either case are, after all, the same; nay, it is well known that the making or regulating of a small watch may require more nimble and careful fingers than the large clock of a Cathedral. We are so apt to imagine that the man who performs a great work is a great man, though from revelations lately made, we ought to have learnt how small—nay, how mean—some of these so-called great men have really been."

POWER OF SELF-DEFENCE.

Anglo-Indian papers like the *Englishman* say:—

"A country which is *unable to stand by itself* in all things, to finance itself, to defend itself, is obviously not ready to govern itself."

Is there any British colony which can stand by itself in all things? Can any of them defend itself? But for British Imperial protection Japan could annex Australasia, and the United States could annex Canada. On the outbreak of the Boer war, it was Indian troops who landed first in the British South African Colonies to defend them. But, though the British colonies cannot defend themselves, they are not considered unworthy of self-government.

Is France able to defend herself, standing alone by herself? Obviously not. For, then British soldiers and Indian sepoys would not have been on French soil to defend France. Is England able to stand all

alone in self-defence? Obviously not. For she has requisitioned the aid of her allies and her colonies. The help of even poor despised India could not be dispensed with; for her sons have been sent to fight for the British Empire in Europe, Asia and Africa. Germany could not stand by itself. It depends on the help of its allies. It does not then seem to be axiomatic that a country which cannot defend itself with its own resources alone is "not ready to govern itself."

Financial Independence.

As for financial independence, we do not know whether there is any civilized country in which foreign capital is not invested. Not to speak of Asiatic countries like Japan, China, Persia, &c., which are self-ruling, European countries like Russia are being developed with foreign capital. Even in England there were millions of German money invested, and, similarly there was British capital invested in Germany. It is true millions upon millions of British capital has been invested in India. But that fact ought not to stand in the way of our obtaining self-government. British capital had been sunk in Mysore before the Rendition, but that province was nevertheless restored to the former ruling family. British investments in India are much smaller than in foreign countries. According to the *Statist*, up to the end of December, 1915, British capital in India and the Colonies, exclusive of the advances made by Government to the colonies, amounted to £1,935,740,000, out of which no more than a sum of £389,980,000 found its way to India and Ceylon together. British investments in Canada and Newfoundland amount to £570,497,-000, and those in Australasia amount to a further sum of £443,438,000, while those in South Africa alone amount to £372,017,000. If these investments of British capital in the colonies have not stood in the way of their obtaining self-government, why should similar investments prevent India receiving

her birthright ? British investments in foreign countries amount to £1,900,364,000, of which £650,000,000 are in the United States of America and £342,000,000 in the Argentine Republic. During the present war England has been obliged partly to finance her allies. As for herself she has had to go to the American market for money. It would seem then that financial independence could not be taken as an essential qualification for self-government.

It may not be irrelevant here to point out that England owes her present opulent condition to capital taken from India,—how we need not say. Readers of Mill's *History of India* and Brooks Adams's *Law of Civilization and Decay* know that British industrial development would not have been possible without transferring to Great Britain much of India's hoarded wealth, amounting to hundreds of millions, from after the battle of Plassey.

"Rome was not built in a day."

We are often reminded by both Indians and Anglo-Indians that "Rome was not built in a day." It is meant thereby to tell us that as England and other free and self-governing countries took centuries to evolve and learn to work their present advanced political institutions, India ought not to expect to become self-governing in the course of a few years. From the historical primers which we read at school, we did indeed learn that it took Rome centuries to grow from the collection of huts, which Romulus and Remus probably built, into a city of palaces and cathedrals with magnificent suburban villas. But in later times, it did not take quite as much time to build Washington, Melbourne, Sydney, San Francisco, Chicago, or new Dacca; nor is it expected that new Delhi or new Bankipur would take centuries or even decades to build. The present up-to-date steam engines of various sorts can trace their descent to Hero's apparatus, constructed B. C. 130. If a student of mechanical engineering now wants to learn to make a steam-engine, he does not begin

with making Hero's machine, nor does he learn the art in 130+1916=2046 years. He becomes a finished mechanic in a few years. The marvels of modern chemistry have grown from the days of the alchemists in the course of centuries. But the modern student of chemistry learns the science not by toiling for centuries through a hundred births and re-incarnations, but in less than a decade. The youth apprenticed to the ship-building trade does not begin with dug-outs or canoes, but with the most up-to-date vessels, mastering the art of building the latest merchant vessels and dreadnoughts in a few years. The modern mechanic who wants to manufacture all sorts of weapons for the army and the navy, does not go to a museum to see how the palæolithic and the neolithic men made their stone hatchets or flint spearheads and arrow-heads in order to imitate them. He learns in the course of a few years to make machine guns, 15 inch cannon, shells and torpedoes. The modern Japanese did so learn from the West, and are now teaching and helping the West in some cases. When 50 years ago the Japanese youths who subsequently came to be known as the elder statesmen went to all the most civilized countries of the world to learn the art of government, they did not bother their heads with the witenagemot and the eorls and the ceorls and the cnihts, but at once set about to learn and did learn in a few years all that there was to learn about the latest representative institutions and their working; and the school of experience afterwards made them what they became.

The art of statesmanship, like all other arts, is and can be learnt in a single life-time. The British baby who afterwards grows up into a statesman is born just as ignorant as the Indian baby. British infants are no more born with the general's baton or the statesman's portfolio than are Indian babies born with the coolie's spade or stone-breaking hammer. Given the same opportunity and facilities, the Indian baby is sure to equal any other baby in

development. If statecraft were entirely or mainly inherited, all or most of the descendants of all or most statesmen would have become statesmen, and few boys whose fathers were not statesmen could have become statesmen. Abraham Lincolns would then have been impossible. Mr. Asquith or Mr. Lloyd George has learnt what he has in his own lifetime, Count Okuma has learnt in the same space of time, so has Dadabhai Naoroji; so did Asoka, Chandragupta, Samudragupta, Sher Shah, Akbar, Aurungzib, Shivaji and others. Their ancestors did not pile up knowledge and experience of statecraft for them and physiologically transmit it to them. There may or may not be some truth in hereditary talent or racial characteristics; but it has always been a conscious or unconscious trick on the part of the few in possession of power and privilege to try to persuade the many outside the pale to believe that birth is the sole or most dominant determining factor in the making of the destiny of individuals and nations. In India the trick succeeded to so great an extent that for generations Sudras have continued to our own day to believe that it was only by acquiring merit after numerous births that they could become Brahmans or "twice-born." But now the spell seems to have broken even in India. Many persons hitherto known as Sudras now claim to be twice-born.

The evolution of a thing or the discovery of a truth or a method takes a long time, involves great labour and may require much genius; but to acquire a knowledge of them is a very much shorter and easier process.

The reader should bear in mind in this connection what Lecky has said about statecraft in the passage quoted before (p. 6). It does not require generations or centuries *to learn* statecraft, though it may have taken centuries *to evolve and perfect* the art, just as it does not take generations or centuries to learn any other art, science or craft, though the latter may have arrived at their present state of

perfection or maturity after centuries. In the case of all the other arts this fact has been tacitly admitted; in the case of statesmanship or statecraft, however, it seems to be denied. But facts with their incontrovertible logic have come to the rescue of all struggling and aspiring nations. It is within living memory that the Serbians, Bulgarians and Rumanians have become free after long centuries of subjection to Turkey. They did not take centuries or generations to learn statecraft, but began to manage their affairs efficiently as soon as they got the chance to do so. It cannot be urged that they are more intelligent or braver than the Indians, or that their civilisation is of older date than that of India. If it be urged that they are Europeans, and what is true of Europeans cannot be true of Asiatics, we can cite the case of the Japanese, who, from the commencement of the Meiji or new era, began to govern their country in the most approved fashion. The Japanese possess an ancient civilization, which, it may be urged, fitted them for their new career of political progress. But the Filipinos have not started with any such real or supposed qualification; and yet they are satisfactorily exercising the right of self-rule after an apprenticeship of less than a decade under American administrators. Should it be urged explicitly or by implication that our only disqualifications are that we are Indians and that we have been under British rule for more than a century and a half, we must throw up the sponge and confess to being thoroughly beaten.

Capacity for Self-rule Relative: No absolute standard of fitness for Self-rule.

In these notes we have used the term self-rule in the sense of the administration of the affairs of a country by indigenous agency, under different kinds of constitution. There is no absolute standard of fitness for self-rule in this sense. Like every other kind of capacity, the capacity for

self-rule is relative. There is no nation on earth which is absolutely, perfectly fit for self-rule. From the very fact that they are all self-ruling it must be acknowledged that the English are fit, the Irish are fit, the Germans are fit, the Belgians are fit, the Montenegrins are fit, the Japanese and the Chinese are fit, the Ethiopians are fit, the Negroes of Liberia are fit, the Negroes of Haiti are fit, the uncivilised Maori and Gilbert Islanders are fit, the Serbs, the Boers, the Bulgars, the Filipinos and the Afghans are fit, the Nepalese are fit. But have they all made equal progress, or are they all equally powerful? God has not fixed the exact degree, kind or measure of capacity which would entitle a nation to self-rule; nor is it possible for any man or nation to fix the standard. The British people in general think that they are perfectly fit for self-rule. But have they always been able to show sufficient ability and tact in the administration of the affairs of their own country? If they had, there would not have been so many revolutions, rebellions and riots and so much bloodshed in their history. Like all other peoples they have occasionally committed great blunders. They have blundered even in the course of the present war. But even the most serious mistakes are not held, and justly so, to disqualify free and independent nations for self-rule. What then is the validity of the objection that Indians being inexperienced would often go wrong if allowed to govern themselves, and they ought not, therefore, to have self-rule? The man who never made a mistake never did anything of any value. The infant who never fell or stumbled, never learnt to walk. Nations learn and become strong and progressive both by their failures and their successes.

British capacity for Government.

In their own country the British have shown great administrative ability. But they have not shown equal ability in India. They have, indeed, prevented foreign aggression and established and

maintained peace and order in the country, they have very regularly and strictly collected and spent the revenue, they have on the whole dealt out even-handed justice between Indian and Indian and, in civil cases, between Indians and Europeans, but during their nearly two centuries of rule they have not been able to make India equal to the peoples of the least advanced European countries, and of Japan, in education, in material prosperity, in health, in power of self-defence against external and internal aggressors and in the enjoyment of immunity from the depredations of robbers and wild animals. Among the civilised countries of the world there is no country which is so subject to famines, and pestilences and other epidemics. In 18 years the Americans have made the Filipinos more literate and their country more free from malaria than we have become in 150 years. Japan has attained greater success in fighting malaria in Formosa than our government in India. The good that has resulted from the work of the bureaucracy in India we admit; but judged by the standards we have spoken of, particularly by the two main and essential tests of intellectual and material advancement, the success of the bureaucracy has not been such as to justify them in arrogantly declaiming against the incapacity of the Indians. The relatively poor success of the British Government in India is all the more noteworthy, as the natural resources of India are vast and varied and her inhabitants are not wanting in intelligence, courage, industry, thrift, sobriety and and other good qualities of character.

Character.

Character is one of the chief factors which determine capacity for self-rule. The crime statistics of India compared with those of some of the most civilised countries show that we are not inferior in character to other civilised peoples. Corruption and misappropriation of public money are certainly not more rife in India than in the United States of

America. During the centuries during which England has had parliamentary government, prime ministers and men in both higher and lower political positions have been known to be corrupt and wanting in personal integrity. Redlich and Hirst's book on *Local Government in England* contains extracts from the report of a parliamentary commission, dated 1835, regarding the municipalities and boroughs of that period, from which a few sentences may be quoted :

"In general the corporate funds are but partially applied to municipal purposes, such as the preservation of the peace by an efficient police, or in watching or lighting the town, &c. ; but they are frequently expended in feasting, and in paying salaries of unimportant officers. In some cases, in which the funds are expended on public purposes, such as building public works, or other objects of local improvement, an expense has been incurred much beyond what would be necessary if due care had been taken."

The authors observe :

These symptoms, as the Commissioners clearly show, were not natural, but were the artificial product of a system of political corruption erected and kept up by the ruling oligarchy."

Recent enquiries relating to the Civil Service in England have brought to light glaring instances of nepotism. The assumption that Indians are unfit for self-rule, because there occasionally come to light cases of nepotism, municipal or other jobbery, embezzlement and corruption, is preposterous. When made by Indians it shows both the very high standard by which they judge themselves as well as their ignorance of the history of public morality in other countries ; when made by Westerners, it is either pharisaical and pecksniffian or is due to their ignorance of the history of public morality in many Western self-ruling countries.

See also the paper on "Is Parliamentary Government suited to India ?"

Local Self-government.

Local self-government in India has been, on the whole, as successful as one could reasonably expect from the little freedom enjoyed by the local bodies. Our roads, drains, &c., are not now in a worse con-

dition than when the officials alone were entirely responsible for their upkeep. The Bombay Government has recently granted to several municipalities the right to elect their presidents. The Bengal Government has given the municipalities a free hand in the preparing of their budgets, saying :—

"The Governor in Council is satisfied that the experiment has on the whole justified itself, while at the same time he notices in the affairs of municipalities a growing sense of responsibility and capacity for self-management, which encourages him to believe that further confidence in their powers of financial administration would not be misplaced."

These are indications that local self-government in India has not been a failure.

As regards Canada on the eve of her obtaining self-government, we learn from Lord Durham's report that

"In the rural districts habits of self-government were almost unknown and education is so scantily diffused as to render it difficult to procure a sufficient number of persons competent to administer the functions that would be created by a general scheme of popular local control."

In England the parliamentary commission referred to above reported in 1835 regarding local bodies that "revenues that ought to be applied for the public advantage are diverted from their legitimate use and are sometimes wastefully bestowed for the benefit of individuals, sometimes squandered for purposes injurious to the character and morals of the people." (Quoted in Redlich and Hirst's *Local Government in England.*)

LITERACY.

It has been sometimes asserted that India cannot be self-ruling because of the prevailing illiteracy. In the mouth of the bureaucracy it is a very curious argument. They have not cared to make India more literate than she is. Education is progressing at a snail's pace. In Japan 28 per cent of the children of school age were at school in 1873 ; by 1902-1903 the percentage had risen to 90. In India the percentage is 19.6. When the shears of retrenchment have to be

applied, education is the first to suffer, though at the same time the emoluments of the Indian Civil Service may be increased. It was owing to the opposition of the bureaucracy that Mr. Gokhale's Elementary Education Bill was rejected. Our boys are willing to learn and to pay for their tuition, but there are not schools and colleges enough for them. The people cannot open schools and colleges in sufficient numbers because of the standard of requirements set up by the Education Department.

However, when nearly 50 years ago representative government was established in Japan it was mainly the Samurai who were literate ; among the rest of the population education was not widespread. In India, too, the higher elasses, particularly the males, who alone at present take part in public life, are educated to a considerable extent. And as in all countries representative institutions have been worked in the earlier stages by the higher classes, it would be enough for the purpose of Indian Home Rule if a sufficient number of educated and capable men could be had to represent the people in the local, provincial and Imperial councils. And it is well known that this number can be had.

England has enjoyed representative institutions for centuries, but, education has been widely diffused there only during the last century or so. In the age of King John, when the barons wrested the Great Charter from him, many of the nobility could draw spear-heads more skilfully than the letters of the alphabet ; book-learning was despised by them. In later ages of parliamentary history, too, literacy was not the prevailing feature of English society.

It was Lord Durham's report which led to the granting of parliamentary government to Canada. We find it stated there :

"It is impossible to exaggerate the want of education among the habitants. No means of instruction have ever been provided for them, and they are almost and universally destitute of the qualifications even of reading and writing."

We are also told that in Canada "a great pro-

portion of the teachers could neither read nor write." It was to such a people that representative institutions were granted. In other free countries, also, free institutions and a high percentage of literacy have not always gone together. However, if literacy be considered an essential qualification for self-rule, it is in the power of the rulers to attain the requisite standard within a decade. A century ago India and China were about the most literate countries in the world. It may be possible for us to overtake those who have since then left us behind. Our rulers do not, in actual practice, however, seem always to care much for education. For Government have often nominated men to sit in the provincial and imperial councils who do not know English, though the proceedings of these bodies are conducted in that language.

"If the British Withdrew from India?"

There is one argument which the opponents of Indian self-rule consider a clincher. They say: "If the British went away from India, leaving her to her fate, she would fall a prey to some other powerful nation, as her sons would not be able to defend her against foreign aggression; and these new conquerors would undoubtedly be worse than the English." In the first place, the present Indian demand is for Home Rule, *not Independence;* so why should the British withdraw? No doubt, a self-ruling India would not keep so many highly paid English officials, nor would it be so good a field for *exclusive* commercial and industrial exploitation as it is at present; though that is a somewhat distant contingency. But still some Englishmen would find employment here as they do in the self-governing colonies, and there would still be a sufficiently, and perhaps for some time, an increasingly large and remunerative field for the investment and employment of capital, as there is in the British colonies and in the independent countries of Russia, Turkey, China, Persia, &c. Where the honey is, there will be the bee, too. It is

not in human nature to leave a place where there is hope of gain.

Standing by itself no British colony can defend itself against foreign aggression. It is the might of the British Empire which shields the colonies. Why should not the Empire extend the same help to India on the same terms? Why should England demand from India as the price of defence the monopoly of power, of high appointments and of opportunities for exploitation?

We know the colonials are white and we are not. We are not the kinsmen of the British people. Therefore perhaps the underlying idea in the minds of many Englishmen may be: "Why should we care to defend your country if the bargain be that we are to receive the blows and you are to receive the blessings, we are to do the hard work, and you are to roll in wealth and luxury?" But as we have been often told by many English notables that England's work in India is philanthropic, it would be highly noble of Englishmen and extremely creditable to them if, from altruistic considerations, they remained in India to defend it even after the grant of Home Rule to India, until we were able to do so ourselves. Should it, however, be considered a very unconscionable bargain, we would respectfully suggest that in future Englishmen would do well not to lay exclusive stress on England's philanthropic mission in India. We may also be permitted to remind Englishmen that *we* also defend India and receive the blows and are eager to be allowed to do so in the future in ever-increasing measure.

It is not exclusively our fault that we are unable entirely to defend ourselves. As both Sir S. P. Sinha and Mr. Haque said and showed in their presidential addresses, in 1915, Government have not helped us to be strong, have even kept us weak.

There is a way out of the difficulty. Indian soldiers have given unquestionable proofs of soldierly qualities. In the pre-British period and in the early days of British rule, people of every province of

British India could and did enter the army. That practice should be revived, and Indians should be trained both as privates and commissioned officers in all sections of the army, including artillery. An Indian aerial fleet and an Indian navy should be built, manned by Indians. In this way England could yet make India self-dependent as regards her defence. It might still be England's proud boast that she made India stronger than she had found it; —it is not so now, perhaps the reverse. If England did her duty in this respect in the way suggested, it would be to *her* advantage also. For the present European war is certainly not the last great world war. In the next, and perhaps still more terrible and destructive, war, England would require the help of a strong India. If India were not strengthened, England might have to regret it. As for ourselves, we are accustomed to adversity, and ought to be able to face the hardest decrees of providence with unblinking eyes. For who knows whether it would not be necessary for India to pass through the fire of still greater tribulations than in the past before she could reach the goal of her high destiny by getting rid of her fatal weakness? It is for England, prosperous, happy England, to consider whether she would be able to meet adversity in the same way. For, under present circumstances, *so far as human eyes can see*, England and India require each other's help. We know it; whether the proud prosperity of England has blinded her to it or not, we do not know. Perhaps England thinks that she alone is indispensable to India, but not India also to her. All this humanly speaking. The real fact may be that each may be able to do without the other, that each may even be better for parting company with the other in a friendly way. But we do not know what lies hidden in the womb of futurity. Time will show.

Some Anglo-Indian journals remind us from time to time that if the British were to withdraw from India, many of the various races and sects inhabiting India would fly at one another's throats.

We shall have something to say on racial and other strife in another part of the book. Here we content ourselves with saying that though the Marquess of Hastings saw *actual* inter-racial and inter-provincial warfare in India in his day, that did not prevent him from dipping boldly and prophetically into the future and finding there a *perfectly self-ruling* India, *friendly* to Great Britain. He wrote as follows in his private journal, under date the 17th of May, 1818:—

"A time *not very remote* will arrive when England will, on sound principles of policy, wish to relinquish the domination which she has gradually and unintentionally assumed over this country, and from which she cannot at present recede. In that hour it would be the proudest boast and most delightful reflection that she had used her sovereignty towards enlightening her temporary subjects, so as to enable the native communities to walk alone in the paths of justice, and to maintain with probity towards their benefactress that commercial intercourse in which we should then find a solid interest."—*The Private Journal of the Marquess of Hastings*, Second Edition, Vol. II, p. 326.

INTERNAL TROUBLES.

Another serious consequence which is apprehended to follow from the imaginary threatened withdrawal of the English from India in case we insisted upon having self-rule is that there would be no end of sectarian, racial, and caste fights in India. But, we again ask, why should they withdraw ? And particularly, why should they withdraw before making India strong and united ? But supposing they obstinately insisted upon withdrawing and carried out their threat, what would be the result ? We have briefly dealt above with the contingency of aggression from without. As for internal troubles, the history of all countries, including European, shows that no country has been entirely free from them in any age. Internecine wars and civil wars and riots have occurred in all countries. After a time either the conflicting parties have composed their differences or some have gained the upper hand and thus somehow or other order has been re-established. What has happened in other countries would happen in India also. We are not a particularly quarrelsome

people. In addition to racial or sectarian or class fights, which we sometimes have in India, Westerners have their labour and capital riots, their suffragette fights, and their election riots, too, which we have not got in India. Should the English leave India, we might have the good sense not to indulge in mutual fighting at all. If we fought, the state of disorder would not be everlasting; peace and order would return exactly in the same way or ways as in other countries. It is true that when the different European nations were fighting for supremacy in India, there was great anarchy and disorder, and the English gradually evolved order out of chaos. But such periods of disorder are to be found in the history of every country and continent. They are not peculiar to India. Had India been particularly and always a land of disorder, it could not have become a prosperous civilised country. One single proof of its former prosperity should be conclusive. It is that from remote antiquity various nations of the West have sought to monopolize the trade of India. As for its civilization, Sir Thomas Munro wrote even so late as the first quarter of the last century that if there were at that time an exchange of that commodity between England and India, England would gain by the import cargo. A country does not grow civilized in the midst of chronic disorder. That India of the future might possibly remain free from racial or sectarian riots even though the English were not to be here as policemen and peace-makers, would seem to be indicated by the fact that in the Native States there are not so many "religious" riots as in British India.

But we do not really see any reason why the English should withdraw from India, nor believe that they will.

Caste.

It is said that India ought not to have self-government because it is a caste-ridden country. We are not apologists of caste. We belong to a commu-

nity one of whose objects is to break down the barriers of caste,—an object which has been attained to a great extent. We may be permitted to ask whether the ancient Greek republics were not self-governing in spite of the existence of the helots, whether before the Civil War there were not Negro slaves in America who were in many respects worse treated than our parias, whether Negroes are not still lynched there, whether many of the worst features of caste do not exist today in America, and, lastly, whether there are not class distinctions in Great Britain somewhat similar to caste. In an article in the *North American Review* Mr. Sydney Brookes says :

> Time and again have I been assured by Americans, Canadians and Australians that what most impressed them in that England which has been killed by the war was the prevalence of the caste system. They were quite right. The caste system was beyond doubt the outstanding feature of the British structure. It was the caste system that made the West End of London the governing centre of the Empire. It was the caste system that in every British Ministry reserved an excessive number of places for the aristocracy, whose title to them was based mainly on the non-essentials of birth, manners, and social position.

Mr. Brookes continues :—

> What was it at bottom that made the English atmosphere before the war so difficult for an American to breathe in freely ? It was, I believe, that he felt himself in a country where the dignity of life was lower than in his own ; a country where a man born in ordinary circumstances expected, and was expected, to die in ordinary circumstances ; where the scope of his efforts was traced beforehand by the accident of position ; where he was handicapped in all cases and crushed in most by the superincumbent weight of convention, "good form," and the deadening artificialities and conventions of an old society. * * There were some trades and professions and occupations that were "respectable" and others which were not . . . There was not a single Englishman who had not the social privilege of despising some other Englishman, and the lower one penetrated in the social scale the more complex and mysterious and the more rigidly drawn did these lines of demarcation become.

Lately the *Jewish World* brought to light an incident which proved the existence of caste-prejudice in England. While on the recruiting campaign, Sergeant Issy Smith, V. C., was invited to a restaurant,

and its owner refused to serve the Jewish hero. *The Jewish World* continues :

The insult to Sergeant Smith as a Jew could be placed comfortably with the huge pile of such insults Jews have from time to time received from the more ignorant and petty-minded of the population among whom they live. But we think it is unique to find a man holding a licence daring to insult not alone the King's uniform, but the Victoria Cross which His Majesty with his own hands only a few weeks ago pinned upon the breast of one of the brave defenders of the country.

Regarding caste in America, two extracts from two well-known American journals will suffice for our present purposes. *The Literary Digest* says :—

For several days before the people of St. Louis voted to segregate the negroes of the city, negro girls and women handed out circulars on the streets bearing a cartoon depicting a white man driving a negro before him and lashing his bare back, with the inscription "Back to slavery." And now that the two ordinances embodying segregating have been carried by a three-to-one vote in a centrally located city of 700,000 inhabitants, the New York *Evening Post* alludes ironically to "the two watch-words of democracy—emancipation and segregation," and the New York *World* deplores the attempt "to deprive black men of property, liberty, and hope." But the New Orleans *Times-Picayune* observes that "the separation or segregation of the races" which "prevails generally through the South" on cars, boats, and in public places "has caused no special injury to any one," and "has unquestionably tended to prevent friction between the races when travelling, which of old frequently developed into serious disturbances and what were called 'race-riots.' "...

It forbids negroes to move into blocks in which as many as 75 per cent. of the occupants are white, and prohibits "the use by negroes in 'white' or 'mixed' blocks of any building or part of a building for a church, dance-hall, school, theater, or place of assemblage for negroes."

The American Journal of Sociology says :

"The constitution of six of the American States prohibit negro-white intermarriages. Twenty-eight of the states have statute laws forbidding the intermarriage of negro and white persons. Twenty of the states have no such laws ; in ten of those latter states bills aimed at the prevention of negro-white intermarriages were introduced and defeated in 1913."

"The Alabama constitution prohibits the legislature from passing a law legalizing the intermarriage of white persons and *any* descendant of a negro. This means that a person whose ancestry may be traced to a negro—even though that person has no detectable physical mark of negro ancestry—may not marry a white person.

"The Florida constitution prohibits intermarriage between white persons and others possessing even one-sixteenth or more negro blood. Many such persons do not physically show their affinity with the negro race.

"The other four states, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee, by their constitutions prohibit the intermarriage of white persons and others having one-eighth or more negro blood."

"Four states appear from their statutes to acknowledge that the existing laws against negro-white intermarriage do not reach all causes of negro-white amalgamation. Three of those states have, in addition to laws against intermarriage, laws against cohabitation and against concubinage."

"Alabama is the only state which would seem to have attempted to reach all the causes of negro-white amalgamation. Her laws include this phrase : 'if any white person or any negro ....live in adultery or fornication with each other, each of them must, on conviction, be imprisoned............"

Those who wish to understand more fully that the U. S. A. is the greatest republic in the world in spite of the presence there of all the retrograde, inhumanly unjust and unrighteous features of caste, should read Mr. Lajpat Rai's book on "The United States of America."

RACE.

It is rather late in the day to speak of the people of India as racially disqualified. We will, however, quote in reply a few brief passages from the report of the *First Universal Races Congress*. Mr. G. Spiller, honorary organiser of the Congress, says in his paper on "The Problem of Race Equality,"

"We need not include in our problem every tribe and race whatsoever, but only the vast aggregate of mankind, say, China, Japan, Turkey, Persia, India, Egypt, Siam, the Negro, the American Indian, the Philippino, the Malay, the Maori, and the fair-white and dark-white races. These constitute, perhaps nine-tenths of the human race."

and comes to the conclusion :—

"We are, then, under the necessity of concluding that *an impartial investigator would be inclined to look upon the various important peoples of the world as, to all intents and purposes, essentially equals in intellect, enterprise, morality, and physique.*"

In the paper on "The Rationale of Autonomy"

contributed to the same Congress by Mr. John M. Robertson, M. P., we read :—

"It would seem that a first step towards a scientific or even a quasi-rational view of the problem must be to put aside the instinctive hypothesis that faculty for self-government is a matter of "race." "

Again :—

"If the problem be reduced to its elements, in short, it will be found that none of the a *priori* arguments against autonomy for any race have any scientific validity. As a matter of fact, practical autonomy exists at this moment amongst the lowest and most retrograde races of the earth ; and probably no experienced European administrator who has ever carried his thinking above the levels of that of a frontier trader will confidently say that any one of these races would be *improved* by setting up over them any system of white man's rule which has yet been tried."

THE EDUCATED A MINORITY.

Another objection is that in India the educated men are a minority, and they do not understand the wants and feelings of the mass of the people and cannot, therefore, be considered their representatives. Even if this were taken to be true, the reply would be: "The foreign bureaucracy are a far smaller minority ; they understand the wants and feelings of the mass still less, differing from them as they do in race, language, religion, customs, habits, &c., and being also birds of passage ; and therefore their right to speak for the mass of the people is non-existent." But in reality the educated minority are sprung from the uneducated majority in the villages and towns, they are bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh, they come from the same homes in which dwell the majority, they speak the same language and profess the same religions and follow the same customs as the majority, they can feel for them and know their wants and can voice their grievances, and many educated persons are in increasing numbers devoting thier time, money and energies to the *unpaid* service of the unlettered poor. The bureaucracy may know the statistics of India better than ourselves, but we know India from the inside ; for we have

been inside hovels, huts, cottages and palaces and have dwelt therein, and have shared with our sisters and brethren their joys, sorrows and anxieties. How many hours during the whole course of their official careers do the officials, big and small, spend in the houses of the people? The white officials have knowledge of criminals, suppliants and flatterers. But what intercourse is there between them and the people, as between man and man? How many minutes in the year do they or can they spend in conversation with those who cannot speak English?

In all countries, particularly in the early stages of self-government, it is the better educated and more intelligent persons, forming a minority, who manage public affairs. Why should, then, such a state of things be considered a disqualification in the case of India? In South Africa the Europeans are a very small minority, and they differ from the indigenous population in race, complexion, language, religion, dress, manners and customs. But still the whites are considered competent to manage the affairs of the whole population, black and white. Why, then, should the educated minority be considered unfit to be the representatives and trustees of their kinsfolk, the unlettered majority?

"The minority cannot make the majority obey."

It has been objected that the minority in India, though competent to make laws, would not be able to secure the obedience of the majority. We reply, How do you know? Our countrymen are certainly more law-abiding than Westerners, and more deferential to the educated classes. As for securing obedience, were the governing class in England able to secure the obedience of the vast numbers of labourers who occasionally struck, and paralysed industry, were they able to secure the obedience of the suffragettes, and, lastly, could they secure the obedience of the Ulster party led by Sir Edward Carson, or could they secure the obedience of the

Sinn Feiners who rebelled? We refer to the period before the war. In South Africa, did not a section of the Boers rebel against Botha's government? Regarding the previous centuries of British history, Mr. John M. Robertson, M. P., writes in his paper on "The Rationale of Autonomy" contributed to the first Universal Races Congress :—

"Now, within the English-speaking world, the mother country had civil wars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; there was civil war between mother country and colonies towards the end of the eighteenth; and again within the Independent United States and within Canada in the nineteenth—all this in a "race" that makes specially high claims to self-governing faculty. On the imperialist principle a Planetary Angel with plenary powers would have intervened to stop the "premature experiment" of Anglo-Saxon self-government at any one of the stages specified—if indeed he had ever allowed it to begin."

LAWYERS AND "FIGHTING RACES."

It is said again that in a self-governing India, the lawyers would rule the roast, not the "manlier fighting races."

The distinction between the military and non-military classes is an artificial one; and it does not at present obtain in any civilised country, anybody belonging to any class being entitled to become a soldier provided he is of the prescribed age and satisfies the physical requirements. In India itself more than half a century ago General Jacob wrote :—

"The attending to, acknowledging at all, in any way, any distinction of race, tribe, caste, etc., as giving any rights or implying any merits, appear to me to be a very great error.

"Men should be enlisted with reference to individual qualifications only. Any race, tribe or caste, the individuals of which possessed high personal qualifications, would necessarily predominate over the others, but simply on account of their personal and individual qualifications." *Papers connected with the Reorganization of the army in India*, presented to both houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty, 1859.

And now after the lapse of some 57 years soldiers are being recruited from many so-called "non-military" races, including Bengalis. The distinction between the fighting and non-military races, therefore, is not absolute, and promises to disappear ere

long. And the "fighting races," too, have produced and are producing lawyers. So that the fighting races and the races producing lawyers are not mutually exclusive.

To be a lawyer is no disqualification for the higher and highest offices of State. Does not the British Cabinet usually contain many lawyers? Is not the present Premier even in these critical times of war a lawyer? Was not his predecessor a lawyer? Has Mr. Lloyd George the lawyer been a failure as a War Minister? There is "Vakil Raj" in all countries to a greater or less extent. It is in India alone that a "Vakil Raj" is an object of ridicule,—probably because law stands in the way of the autocratic ways of the bureaucracy.

A great part of the most essential and fundamental work of governments is concerned with the making of laws, rules and regulations and their proper administration and enforcement. It is difficult to discover why, under the circumstances, lawyers should be considered particularly unfit for this kind of work.

It is an unwritten principle of the British constitution that the army and the navy should be subordinate to the civilian element. Accordingly the ministers are mostly taken from the civil population, and so are members of Parliament. Why in India alone the sepoys are to be regarded as better statesmen than the lawyers and other members of the learned professions, is both a mystery and not a mystery.

The predominant influence of the lawyers in the American colonies before their separation from Great Britain and the causes and consequences thereof will be found described in another part of this booklet.

Can India Produce an Electorate?

Mr. Lionel Curtis writes in *The Problem of the Commonwealth*:

"In India the rule of law is firmly established. Its maintenance is a trust which rests on the government of the Commonwealth, until such time as there are Indians enough, able to dis-

charge it. India may contain leaders qualified not only to make but also to administer the laws; but she will not be ripe for self-government until she contains an electorate qualified to recognize those leaders and place them in office. From its nature, national self-government depends, not upon the handful of public men needed to supply cabinets and parliaments, but on the electorate, on the fitness of a sufficient proportion of the people themselves to choose rulers able to rule. Such men there are already, but not in sufficient numbers, to assume the control of Indian affairs." (P. 207).

Mr. Curtis is not unwilling to admit that India may contain "rulers able to rule," though "not in sufficient numbers"; the difficulty which he raises is the absence of a sufficiently large and qualified electorate "to recognise those leaders and place them in office." Let us see whether we are not yet fit immediately to take the first step towards really representative and responsible self-government. Mr. Curtis needs reminding that countries which are now self-governing, like England, Canada, or Germany, did not, when they started on the career of self-rule, have an electorate sufficiently large and qualified to choose the leaders, such as he requires India to show. But it may be considered impertinent on our part to suggest a comparison with the earlier stages of self-rule in independent or self-ruling countries. So, let us take the case of a country which is dependent like India.

After a century and a half of British rule in India, we may be thought qualified to have what political rights the Filipinos possessed before the passage of the Jones Bill in a modified form in 1916:—and they have been under American rule for only 18 years. These rights, *obtained within nine years of the American occupation*, will be understood from the summary of the Philippine constitution, as described in the *Statesman's Year Book* for 1916. *

* The Central Government in the Philippines is composed of the Governor-General, who is the chief executive and president of the Philippine Commission, and eight Commissioners, three Americans and five Filipinos. The Philippine Commission constitutes the Upper House and the elective Philippine Assembly the Lower House of the Legislative.

The Philippine electorate consisted of about 200,000 persons, before the passage of the new law a few months ago. The civic rights of the Filipinos have now been further expanded and the new law will grant the voting rights to about 800,000 men. But may we have, as a beginning, even the rights enjoyed by the 200,000 men before the passage of the new law ? The Filipinos are not a more intelligent and civilized people than the Indians nor were their ancestors more intelligent, and civilized than ours. Nor can it be said that before the American occupation, they were more accustomed to civilized methods of self-government than ourselves. The right to elect their legislators and rulers which they have hitherto exercised under American suzerainty can, therefore,be exercised by us.

The population of the Philippine Islands is nine millions in round numbers. We may take the male population to number four and a half millions. Thus the 200,000 voters form a little more than 4.4 per cent of the total male population. Can not the British provinces of India show at least 4.4 per cent of adult males who are qualified to elect their rulers and legislators ? That is the question.

Mr. Curtis says :

"The exercise of political power by a citizen must obviously depend on his fitness to exercise it. The degree of fitness differs in individuals ; but in practice there must be some rough-and-ready tests, such as that of domicile, age, property or education, by which it is determined."

body. The members of the Assembly hold office for four years, and the Legislature elects two Resident Commissioners to the United States, who hold office for the same term. These are members of the United States' House of Representatives with a voice, but not a vote. The islands are divided into 36 provinces of which 31 are regular and the rest special. The Government of each of the regular provinces is vested in a provincial board composed of a Governor and two 'vocals'. The Governor is the chief executive of the province and presiding officer of the board. He and the 'vocals' of the board are all elected by popular vote The Government of towns is practically autonomous, the officials being elected by the qualified voters of the municipalities and serving for four years.

There would be no difficulty about the qualification of domicile; as for age, that of legal majority will do; regarding property and educational qualifications, there are free countries which insist on both, there are others which insist on neither, and there are some which insist on only one of the two.

Some countries (*e.g.*, Austria, Germany, France) have adopted the principle of what is often termed "manhood or universal suffrage," *i.e.*, every male adult, not a criminal or a lunatic, being entitled to a vote, but in all cases some further qualifications than mere manhood are required, as in Austria a year's residence in the place of election, or in France a six months' residence. A common qualification is that the elector should be able to read and write. This is required in Italy and Portugal and some of the smaller European states, in some states of the United States and in many of the South American republics.—*The Encyclopaedia Britannica.*

A property qualification is required in many countries. As it is not possible to say offhand how many men in India possess a certain fixed property qualification, we shall judge of the number of possible electors according to the qualifications of domicile, age, and education. Indian males become adult at eighteen for many legal purposes. But for the right to vote, we shall take the age of majority to be 20, as, *e. g.*, in Hungary, or 21, as in many other countries. Let us now see how many *literate* males of the age of 20 and over each British province contains, and what proportion of the total male population they constitute, according to the census of 1911.

Province.	Total males.	Literate Males of 20 and over,	Percentage of adult literate Males to total.	
Assam	3,467,621	220,652	Over	6·0
Bengal	23,365,225	2,363,250	,,	10·0
Bihar and Orissa	16,859,929	1,008,137	,,	5·0
Bombay	10,245,847	921,301	,,	9·0
Burma	6,145,471	1,802,573	,,	29·0
C. P. Berar	6,930,392	356,257	,,	5 0
Madras	20,382,955	2,112,038	,,	10·0
N.-W. F. P.	1,182,102	53,244	,,	4·5
Punjab	10,992,067	565,719	,,	5·0
U. P.	24,641,831	1,097,097	,,	4 4
India	124,213,440	10,500,268	,,	8·6

It has been stated before that the 200,000 Filipino voters form a little more than 4·4 per cent. of the total male population of the Philippine Islands. The table given above shows that the most backward provinces of India contain that and more than that proportion of adult males who can read and write, and British India taken as a whole possesses adult literate males who are 8·6 per cent. of the total number of males; and they would certainly be able to exercise the right of voting at elections as intelligently as voters of average intelligence in all free countries and certainly in the Philippines. It cannot be truthfully contended that our average of intelligence is lower than that in the least advanced of free countries which possess some sort of representative self-government. If the Maoris of New Zealand and the Kaffirs and Hottentots can exercise the right of voting, why cannot Indians? There are in India many illiterate men who have shops of moderate dimensions and farms of moderate size, which they manage successfully. They also should be entitled to the franchise. There is not the least doubt that according to either property or educational qualifications (as for example in Portugal, where, if a man can read and write, he need not have the property qualification), in addition to the qualifications of age and domicile, there can be a sufficiently large electorate in every province of India. Our people have been accustomed to representative methods in caste and rural organisations from time immemorial. From social affairs to civic, the transition is not difficult of achievement; and elections in connection with village panchayats, unions, municipalities, local boards, district boards, provincial councils and the imperial council have been accustoming people to elections. We prefer not to refer here to the civic and political achievements of our forefathers.

The objection is sometimes raised that what is possible in a small country, is not practicable in a large one. But when our political critics have to

deny that Indians are a nation, they assert that Bengal, the Punjab, Maharashtra, &c., are distinct and separate countries. Why not, then, give us the benefit of this assertion, and treat Bengal, &c., as distinct entities? These comparatively small tracts may then be made at least as autonomous as the Philippines were before the passing of the new law.

The proportion of adult literates given above has been calculated on the basis of the census of 1911. That proportion is now somewhat larger, and will go on increasing.

Our "path to freedom" is, as Mr. Curtis says, "primarily a problem of education" But sufficient education also can be had only through freedom. Unless we have self-rule and can control the purse, we can never have sufficient education. It is a perfect vicious circle. Bureaucrats of the Indian Civil Service do not include an entirely literate India in their scheme of things; for they know that an educated India will not tolerate the possession by them of exclusive privileges.

The electors in self-governing countries should possess character and intelligence, in order that they may be able to choose the right men as their representatives. In these two respects our countrymen do not lag behind each and every self-governing nation. In Great Britain itself the elector has been described as follows by Mr. Harold Cox in the *Edinburgh Review* :—

"The present elector is what Providence and the party system have made him. The labour of earning a precarious income, and the pleasure of spending on a few modest luxuries any small balance that remains after the bare necessities of life have been provided, occupy most of the time and most of the thought of the larger majority of Parliamentary electors. Periodically they are invited by political touts to give their votes to this or that candidate whose name they have never heard before. By way of inducement they are offered all sorts of personal bribes. One candidate will provide them with regular work at good pay; another will give pensions to their aged kinsfolk. Other appeals are made to the passion of hate. An attack on landlords is always popular, because in the mind of the workman the landlord is the man who calls for the weekly rent—a necessarily large fraction of a small wage. An attack on capital is also politically

profitable wherever employers have been acting harshly. By such devices electors who neither know the candidates nor understand the principles they profess are dragged in thousands to the poll and the result is proclaimed as the verdict of the people.

"It is not surprising that men who wish to keep their hands clean shrink from intimate contact with the practical work of winning elections. In all constituencies a very large proportion of the most respected men hold themselves aloof from the business of electioneering, with the result that most of the work is done by little men with small axes of their own to grind."

Lord Bryce gives an equally damaging description of electors *everywhere*. Says he :—

"Though it is usually assumed in platform speeches that the audience addressed are citizens of this attractive type, everybody knows that in all communities, not only in Chicago but even in Liverpool, let us say, or in Lyons, or in Leipzic, a large proportion of the voters are so indifferent or so ignorant that it is necessary to rouse them, to drill them, to bring them up to vote."

Alleged Insufficiency of able Rulers.

Mr. Curtis has admitted in the *Problem of the Commonwealth* that already there are in India "rulers able to rule," but not in sufficient numbers. But where is the proof of this insufficiency ? In what kinds of duties, civil or military, have Indians been given a fair chance to prove their capacity, to which they have not proved equal ? It is the misfortune of dependent peoples that the proof of their fitness is made to depend upon the certificate of their foreign rulers, whose occupation would be gone, at any rate to a great extent, if they gave that certificate.

Fitness to win Self-rule.

There are two kinds of fitness : the fitness to have and exercise a right, and the fitness to win it. The first kind of fitness can be proved by facts and arguments. This we have done. The second kind can be proved only by the logic of achievement, that is, by winning Home Rule. Let us prepare ourselves to prove our fitness in this way, too ; let us win self-rule by constitutional means. But we should bear in mind that constitutional agitation is not all plain sailing. It involves sacrifice and suffering.

In an article on "Indian Nationality" contributed to *The Modern Review* for March, 1908, by the late Rev. John Page Hopps, editor of *The Coming Day* (London), he wrote :—

> "They say India has learnt from English history something of its longing to possess itself, to find her soul. Well, then, let her also learn from England something of our ability and our willingness to pay the price for freedom. She must oppose a brave and stubborn front to the browbeating of the strong. She must rise above mere personal advantages, and throw everything into the common stock for the good of all. She must call nothing 'common and unclean.' She must by courage and capacity earn her right to rule in her own house. She must, on the side of affairs, put science and education and work in the forefront of her struggle, and, on the side of religion, she must make communion with God mean the Brotherhood of Man."

These words all Indians should lay to heart.

CONCLUSION.

We are not unfriendly to the English, nor anxious that they should leave our shores. There is no race which has a fully developed and all-sided manhood. International contact and intercourse are advantageous to all. What we want is room, opportunity, freedom, to grow in all directions. We do not want to be repressed, suppressed, or exploited. Our aim is self-development, self-realization, self-expression, and the giving to the world what we are peculiarly fitted to give. We know our aspirations are just, legitimate, and righteous, and therefore we should not be afraid of consequences. We know it is to the interest of Englishmen not to withdraw from India. But if they do, we should not be anxious. For it is not Englishmen, it is not Europeans, it is not Westerners, who made us or who guide our destiny. A Power superior to all made us and is moulding our lives. Our destiny is in His hands, and next to His, in ours, and then in those of other races.

We are not perfectly fit for self-rule ;—no nation is. We are not entirely unfit for self-rule ;—no nation is. Fitness grows by practice and exercise. We want to grow more and more fit in that way, which is the only way.

INDIA AND DEMOCRACY

BY THE SISTER NIVEDITA.

To an interviewer of the *Madras Mail* a certain distinguished person of Western descent is reported, among other things, to have said : "English democracy cannot be planted in India. India is not fitted for it." This pronouncement chiefly shows that foreigners do not usually take the trouble to grasp the Indian national point of view. Just as the Japanese did not plant the "English" or any other exactly Western type of democracy in Japan, but a national democracy of their own with such personal loyalty to the sovereign as certainly does not exist in England at any rate ; so we are trying to have our own national *Swaraj*. *Swaraj* does not mean an attempt to plant 'English democracy' in India, it means the human right of Indian democracy to find self-expression in its own country and amongst its own people in its own way. Speaking of democracy, however, English people may be startled to hear that in the Indian opinion India has been from ancient times immensely more skilled in the mode and habit of democratic self-government than England has ever cared to know or believe. Were not our wonderful self-contained village-communities democratic ? Are not our caste *panchayets* and *biradaris*, which still maintain a vigorous existence in most provinces, run on democratic lines ? Is not each caste in its internal economy a democracy, in which the richest, most powerful and most learned member is but equal in social position and rights to the humblest ? Is not the undivided Indian family a democracy ? In a joint family, when a point of family conduct or policy is to be settled, it is not unoften seen that all the sons are

gathered and the matter in question decided after due consideration of the opinions of all. It is because democracy existed and exists in our villages, castes, and families, that it is easy to explain at once why the Congress and Western political methods generally have been such a success in India. In one sense, the causes of dissension and the difficulty of preserving unity are greater in the home than in the city, greater in the city than in the nation; for with enlarging area, impersonal considerations become increasingly determinative. To a people, therefore, who are accustomed to this democratic self-government in the most difficult of all spheres, viz., the home or the family, the work of running the country, as our friends the Americans would put it, would not be a very difficult affair. The only difficulty in India has been that the people have not realised the all-of-the-country, so to speak, as the proper function of the all-of-the-people. Consequently they have not yet gained experience as to the things that are the function of Home or Family, or social class on the one hand, and of village, city, province, and nation on the other. But the people are now in increasing measure and rapidly grasping the idea that all the affairs of their country are the concern of all of them, —and the gaining of experience is only a question of time. It is because India has been so profoundly democratic in her *separate* or individual social units, that she has in the past manifested so little power of resistance and so little political acumen. This is a fault which at present, however, bids fair to be corrected, and, once really corrected, under such conditions, will remain so for all time.

But it may be argued that granting that socially India has been used to the democratic mode and habit, where is the proof that politically she has been so accustomed, or is likely to appreciate and effectively use democratic methods? We shall now give such a proof. Ancient India has no history in the usually accepted sense of the word; but she has a history clearly legible in her ancient literature. In her epics

and dramas we find abundant proofs of the fact that her rulers respected and acted according to the opinions of the people and the people in their turn freely expressed their opinion and demanded its recognition;—which we may say is the essence of democracy, the monarchical or republican *forms* of government being mere separable accidents. In the Ramayana it is related in the *Uttarakanda* (Chap. XLXIII), that on his return to Ayodhya from Lanka after rescuing Sita, Rama asked the spy Bhadra to communicate to him both good and evil reports ; "hearing [which] I shall do what is good and eschew what is evil." Here is a distinct promise made by Rama to respect public opinion, and he kept his promise, too. For when he heard that his subjects entertained suspicions regarding the character of Sita, who had dwelt so long in Ravana's capital separated from her husband, he exiled her, though his heart almost broke to do so.

In the Mahabharata it is related that when Sakuntala, whom Dushyanta had married according to the *Gandharva* or mutual-choice form, went to his capital with her son, that king at first would not recognise or accept her, being evidently afraid of the opinion of his subjects. But when a celestial voice declared her in the hearing of all his court to be his lawfully wedded wife and the son to be his, he agreed to accept both mother and son.*

King Yayati nominated his fifth and youngest son as his heir, passing over the claims of the first four. When this became known to his subjects, they remonstrated with him. He had to satisfy them as to the righteousness of the step that he had taken.†

* "114. Having heard these words of the dwellers of heaven, the king of the Puru race was much pleased, and addressing his priests and ministers, he said :—115. Hear all of you the words of the messenger of heaven. I myself know that this boy is my son. 116. If I had accepted him as my son at Sakuntala's words, my people would have been suspicious, and my son also would not have been considered to be pure (of pure birth)." Sambhava Parva, Ch. 74.

† 19 "Yayati became desirous of installing his youngest son, Puru, on the throne. But the four orders of his subjects with Brah-

We wish next to recall the sayings of the people when Yudhisthira was installed as Yuva-raja or heir-apparent. With evident consciousness of the possession of political power, they said, "*We* shall, therefore, * * * install the eldest Pandava * * *." ‡

When again the sons of Pandu, Yudhishthira and his four brothers, went to Varanavata as the result of the machinations of the wicked Kauravas, the people gave vent to their almost rebellious feelings in an unmistakable manner, and they did so

manas at their head thus addressed him : 20. "O Lord, how can you install Puru on the throne, passing over your eldest son Yadu, born of Devayani and grandson of Sukra. 21. Yadu is your eldest son, after him was born Turbasu. Then Sarmishtha's son, Drahyu, Anu, and last Puru. 22. How would it be proper to pass over all the elders and install the youngest ? We represent this to you, *act acording to the precepts of religion.*" *Yayati said :*—23. "Hear all of you of the four orders of the castes with Brahmanas at their head, why my kingdom should not be given to my eldest son. 28. .... Puru is a great friend of mine and he did what was agreeable to me. And the son of Kavi, Usanas, Sukra himself, granted me this boon. 29. The son who would obey me would become the king and the lord of the earth. Therefore I *entreat* you, let Puru be installed on the throne." *The people said :*—30. "O king, it is true that the son who is accomplished and who seeks the good of his parents, deserves all prosperity, though he is the youngest. 31. Therefore, Puru, who has done good to you, deserves to have the kingdom. As Sukra has granted this boon, we have no power to say anything." *Vaishampayana said :*—32. Having been thus addressed by the contented people, the son of Nahusha (Yayati) installed his son Puru on the throne." Samdhava Parva, Ch. 85.

‡ "23. O descendant of Bharata, seeing the sons of Pandu, endued with all accomplishments, the citizens began to speak of their accomplishments in every place of resort. Assembling in court-yards, and in other places of meeting, they talked of the eldest son of Pandu as the person fit for governing the kingdom. 25. (They said), the king Dhritarashtra, though possessed of the eye of knowledge, did not obtain the kingdom, because he was blind. How can he be king (now) ? 26. And the son of Santanu, Bhishma, is of rigid vows and devoted to truth ; having relinquished the kingdom before, he will never accept it now. 27. We shall, therefore, with all proper ceremonies, install the eldest Pandava (Yudhishthira), endued with youth, accomplished in battle, versed in the Vedas, and truthful and kind." Jatugriha Parva, Ch. 143.

with impunity.* This could never have been possible if the absolute autocracy of tyrants had been the rule in India.

If democracy of a certain kind was possible then, it is also possible now, even after the lapse of ages. It is being slowly introduced in Baroda, Travancore, Bikaner, Mysore, &c. It will not be pretended that the Indian statesmen who rule these States know the people and their past less than foreigners.

We have shown that India is not unacquainted with the *spirit* of democracy. But even the *form* of democracy was not entirely absent from India. Let us give only one example. Dr. Hoernle in the address on Jainism that he delivered in 1898, as President of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, stated that Mahavira, the founder of Jainism, was born in a State which was an oligarchic républic, which is a half-way house between monarchy and a pure democracy. Said he:—

"Vaisali is the modern Besarh, about 27 miles north of

* "6. Seeing the sons of Pandu afflicted with sorrow and in grief some of the men of the city spoke thus:—7. The king (Dhritarashtra) sees not things with an equal eye. He is always wicked-minded. The Kuru Dhritarashtra does not cast his eye on virtue. 8. The Pandava (Yudhishthira), the best of all strong men, Bhima or Dhananjaya (Arjuna) will never commit the sin of rebellion. 9. What these illustrious (princes) would do, the two sons of Madri will also do. They have inherited the kingdom from their father but Dhritarashtra cannot bear them. 10. How could Bhishma sanction such an act of great sin? How could he sanction their exile to that wretched city? 11. The son of Santanu, Vichitravirya and the descendant of Kuru, the royal sage Pandu, were to us like our fathers. 12. Now that the best of men (Pandu) having gone to heaven, Dhritarashtra cannot bear these princes, his sons; 13. we cannot sanction this. Therefore, leaving this excellent city and our houses, we shall go to the place where Yudhishthira is going. 14. The King of Virtue, Yudhishthira, reflected for sometime, and then addressed in sorrow the citizens who were talking thus in grief............16. "You are our friends, walking round us and making us happy with your blessings, return to your homes. 17. When the time comes for anything to be done for us by you, then accomplish all that is agreeable and beneficial to us." 18. Having been thus addressed, the citizens walked round the Pandavas and offered them their blessings. They then returned to thecity.

Patna. Anciently it consisted of three distinct portions, called Vaisali, Kundagama and Vaniyagama, and forming, in the main, the quarters inhabited by the Brahman, Kshatriya and Bania castes respectively....... While it existed, it had a curious political constitution; it was an oligarchic republic; its government was vested in a Senate, composed of the heads of the resident Kshatriya clans, and presided over by an officer who had the title of King and was assisted by a Viceroy and a Commander-in-Chief."—Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, No. II, February, 1898, page 40.

On abstract grounds also we take exception to the statement that India, or for that matter, any country, is not fit for any popular system of Government. No doubt everywhere it has been and is a question of training. And this training can be given to any nation. Were all countries where democracy now prevails fitted for democracy from the beginning of time? Did not the divine right of Kings,—even to misgovern,—claim a large number, if not the majority, of Englishmen as its followers, in England itself? Was Japan considered by foreigners fit for democracy half a century ago? Was Persia considered fit a year ago? Is China now considered fit?

After all human nature is everywhere more similar than dissimilar and it is a superficial philosophy that says that a certain country or nation is immutably unfit for or incapable of a certain thing. Emerson made a profoundly true observation when in his essay on History he said that "There is one mind common to all individual men. Every man is an inlet to the same and to all of the same. * * * What Plato has thought he may think: what a saint has felt he may feel; what at any time has befallen any man, he can understand. Who hath access to this universal mind is a party to all that is or can be done, for this is the only and sovereign agent."

"The Congress is trying to introduce a foreign system, and it won't work." But the fact is that it is already at work and working successfully; and we have shown above that democracy is not a

foreign thing in India. Can our critics not see that if what they say had really been the case, the Congress would not have succeeded as it has? Our National Parliament-without-a-Permit is thoroughly an expression of the Indian genius. It is in the political field, what we have been long accustomed to in the religious *mela* or conference and fair combined, in the caste *panchayet* and in the family conference.

We sincerely agree that national education is necessary; but we do not feel honoured by being prescribed the attitude of trying by our good behaviour to bring strong arguments to bear on "the hard-headed Englishman." Although we are quite willing to settle matters amicably with the Englishman, if the latter has that good sense, we do not admit that any foreigner has the right to demand that the Indian nation must prove its "capacity" for "political freedom" before it gets it;—as if such proof were ever possible to give, to the complete satisfaction of the foreign exploiter. Political freedom is the birthright of every nation; and even a bad and inefficient *swadesi* government is much better than the most angelic government by absentee rulers and their irresponsible servants. Does it show great capacity to grasp the drift of the national movement in India to represent "the hard-headed Englishman" as the master of the situation and the arbiter of her destiny? Circumstances are as much beyond his control as they are of ours.

M. R., March, 1907.

HOME RULE FOR INDIA

By John Page Hopps.

The phrase 'Home Rule' is a phrase of ill omen to the ruling classes of Great Britain. When 'Home Rule for Ireland' was talked of at first, it sent a

shiver through Clubland and the Court, through the Stock Exchange and the Church, aad the shiver reached throughout all classes. The real reason for the shiver was the shock that was given to the Briton's sense of possession.

The supreme British phrase is 'Rule Britannia': and its highest word of exhortation is 'Britons hold your own!' Here and there a Briton persuaded himself that England held down Ireland for Ireland's good, aud believed, as usual, that England's rule could never by any one be improved. Here and there, too, were a few advanced spirits who risked everything by being scorned as 'Home Rulers,' just as afterwards they risked everything when they were howled at as 'Pro-Boers': but, in the main, the conventional Briton proposed to fall in with the exhortation to 'Hold his own.'

At the present moment, he has become used to the idea of some sort of self-government of Ireland by Irishmen; and perhaps he is a trifle afraid of what may happen if he is too stubborn, and probably a little ashamed of being so recreant all round to his boasted love of liberty: and it is likely that Ireland is after all on the road to Home Rule.

As for 'Home Rule for India,' that is a cry which has not yet even reached him and very few Englishmen pronounce it. It has yet to win acceptance by the rank and file even of 'Pro-Boers.' But, apart from the cry, good progress has been made with the idea, and tens of thousands of thoughtful Englishmen are getting thoroughly ashamed of our autocratic, masterful and selfish grip of India. Still, it may mislead to insist too strongly on the desire of Englishmen to be just. That is not the ruling passion in England. The liking for power, and a certain unctuous belief that English rule is best for everybody, dominate the abstract desire to be just.

It is, however, important to distinguish between the official and ruling classes and interests and the rank and file of the free thinking class of Englishmen. The official and ruling classes and interests

are very strong and almost entirely determine Great Britain's policy, and decide its action : but behind them, more or less watchful, more or less placid or restless, stand these outposts of freedom-loving Englishmen and from these, India has mnch to hope. But they are ill-informed, and it is India's business to instruct them aud this could easily be done, for they have no antipathies and would gladly listen to what representative Indians had to say. It is not of much use to preach or complain in India. Indians must come and preach and complain here, to Britons on British soil. There is here a vast amount of ignorance about India, just as there was about Ireland, though it lay alongside our own coasts and just as there was about the Boers in South Africa. It is this ignorance that should be assailed. We need the pouring in of information.

It is largely believed here that if British rule in India were relaxed, Indians would fly at one another's throats. As to this, much use could be made of the long series of national congresses held in India, as showing how India is preparing to act as a united whole. It would greatly help if representative men from India came to England to expound the nature of the National Congresses and their proposals.

Connected with this is another difficulty in the way of Home Rule for India. It is said that the country is not homogeneous, and that, with its various races and various languages, Home Rule would be impossible. There may be a difficulty here, but Englishmen who cry 'The Duma is dead. Long live the Duma !' are not the men to insist upon it. Surely, to say the very least, India is as homogeneous as the Russian Empire and has, in every way, a unity, the like of which has no exsistence there, outside of a comparatively limited range. But Russia is not Great Britain's : India is. That makes all the difference.

Alas ! That the sense of possession should make such a difference ! An overwhelming instance of

that stares us in the face in the contrast between what we did in South Africa and what we do in India......

But the people of India, we are told, are not fit for 'Home Rule.' That is to say, *we* say so: we who profit by no Home Rule in India: we who do not want to surrender power: we who think we are the best and ablest rulers in the world and who like to try and prove it. But it is an old cry. It was raised against the middle class in England: it was raised against the mechanics of the great towns: it was raised against the country rustics: it is now being raised against women: and in every case it was raised and is raised by the people in possession who did not and do not want to lose their power.

It is not certain, after all, that the people of India are, on the whole, unfit. The National Congress might very well serve as an object lesson of India's political capacity, and as a preliminary to a Parliament: and it at all events shows what can be systematically done in that sense. But what is 'fit'? And what makes fit? Surely the knowledge of where the boot hurts, and why, has something to do with fitness: and experience will give knowledge how to remedy the hurt. For the rest, India is at least as fit for Home Rule as Russia is for the Duma: and it may safely be said that if the argument of 'not fit' had been too strictly applied to England, the modern House of Commons would never have been born.

What then is to be done? If one Englishman may give advice to India's millions, I think it should be this:—India must be its own saviour. The best course for India is the bold course. She must refrain from pleading for trivial relaxations, and boldly set forth the larger claim, and insist upon it, night and day. Set up associations and unions to do, to actually do, as self-help, much of what legalised Home Rule might be supposed to do. Let the National Congress introduce some kind of unbroken

continuity in its work. Encourage Home Trade as a preliminary to Home Rule. Put not your trust in princes, and in State Secretaries. These are usually but puppets in the hands of unseen powers behind them. You cry, 'What must we do to be saved ?' The only answer is, 'He that believeth shall be saved.' Let Indian patriots believe !

1907. London. *M. R., June, 1907.*

CONTEMPORARY INDIA AND AMERICA ON THE EVE OF SEPARATION FROM ENGLAND

Our English friends, both stay-at-home Britishers as well as Anglo-Indians, are never tired of reiterating certain statements which they consider to be great discoveries and so they utter them in season and out of season in such a manner as to make one feel sick of hearing them. According to them, India is merely a geographical expression, and it did not exist as one country* until the natives of England came out here. They further say that the natives of India are not a homogeneous people, but a very heterogeneous mass,† split up into

* Mr. Vicent A. Smith however says in *The Early History of India* (p. 6): "Twice, in the long series of centuries dealt with in this history, the political unity of India was nearly attained ;" namely, in the reigns of Asoka and Samudragupta.

† In the course of the last Imperial Budget Debate, Sir Harvey Adamson, the Home Member of Council, said :—"The honourable member [Mr. Gokhale], in his tours through India, has formulated a demand for self-government for India on lines of a self-governing Colony. We may all look forward to the day far distant when education shall have permeated throughout India, when the hundreds of races that inhabit it will have attained

separate races and creeds and castes, and therefore, they are not fit for any representative or democratic institutions. There being no common language, and no community of interests in India, its people are incapable of feeling any sentiments of patriotism. It is the English rule that maintains peace in India, otherwise its people would cut one another's throats. These views given expression to by charitable and philanthropic white men, we are accustomed to hear from our very infancy and read in school-books written by them. We will assume for the sake of argument that all their statements are true. But we do not conclude therefrom that the people of India are unfit for any democratic or representative institutions or that the growth of the sentiment of common patriotism is impossible amongst them. If history shows that the people of one country under those very circumstances which now obtain in India, could exhibit patriotism when called npon by circumstances to do so, and representative government in its highest form is working successfully amongst them, there is no reason why there should be any failure in these matters in the case of India.

Let us turn to the circumstances that existed in those British colonies which are now known as the United States of America, before their separation from England. When America was discovered by Columbus, it was inhabited by many tribes whom the European nations designated as Indians. As America was colonised, so the fate of these tribes was sealed. Colonisation means displacement. So the Christian nations almost exterminated the aborigines of America. The colonists did not belong to one race, one creed or to one original country. Respectable

some measure of homogeneousness, and when such form of administration may be feasible, but to set up that type of government at the present day as a plank of practical politics is as illogical and absurd as it would be for a teacher to instruct a pupil in the differential calculus immediately after he had mastered the principles of simple addition."

men were not entirely wanting among them, but, speaking generally, it was the dregs of the countries of Europe who furnished the ranks of the colonists of America. Their character was such that no one considered them capable of self-government. We will quote here the views of some of the authors who had personal knowledge of these colonies before their separation from England and formation into the United States of America.

Burnaby, an acute observer, travelled through these North American Colonies in 1759 and 1760. According to him,

"Fire and water are not more heterogeneous than the different colonies in North America. Nothing can exceed the jealousy and emulation which they possess in regard to each other. The inhabitants of Pennsylvania and New York have an inexhaustible source of animosity in their jealousy for the trade of the Jerseys. Massachussetts Bay and Rhode Island are not less interested in that of Connecticut. The West Indies are a common subject of emulation to them all. Even the limits and boundaries of each colony are a constant source of litigation. In short, such is the difference of character, of manners, of religion, of interest, of the different colonies, that I think, if I am not wholly ignorant of the human mind, were they left to themselves, there would soon be a civil war from one end of the continent to the other; while the Indians and negroes would with better reason impatiently watch the opportunity of exterminating them altogether."

Otis, who was a well-known American patriot, wrote in 1765 :—

"God forbid these ever prove undutiful to their mother-country. Whenever such a day shall come, it will be the beginning of a terrible scene. Were these colonies left to themselves to-morrow, America would be a mere shambles of blood and confusion before little petty States could be settled."

The historian Lecky says :—

"Great bodies of Dutch, Germans, French, Swedes, Scotch, and Irish, scattered among the descendants of the English, contributed to the heterogeneous character of the colonies, and they comprised so many varieties of government, religious belief, commercial interest, and social type, that their union appeared to many incredible on the very eve of the Revolution."*

In India there is not one common language. But

* England in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. IV, p. 12.

that was the case in the colonies too. Lecky writes :—

"Twenty-one years before New York, or, as it was then called, New Amsterdam, fell into the hands of the English, it was computed that no less than eighteen different languages were spoken in or near the town, and it continued under English rule to be one of the chief centres of foreign immigration." *

Even at the present day during the presidential election campaigns in the United States, different parties have to publish pamphlets in 12 or 13 languages.

It is said that there is no patriotism, or community of feeling in India. But things were no better in America before the separation from England. To quote Lecky again, †

"A country where so large a proportion of the inhabitants were recent immigrants, drawn from different nations, and professing different creeds, where, owing to the vast extent of the territory and the imperfection of the means of communication, they were thrown very slightly in contact with one another, and where the money-making spirit was peculiarly intense, was not likely to produce much patriotism or community of feeling."

Men like Lord Reay say that India is not fit for democratic government because its people are mostly illiterate.‡ But the condition of the colonies was no better. Webster, the lexicographer, writes in his Essays :—

"Education is sunk to a level with the most menial services. ... ...Will it be denied that before the war it was a frequent practice for gentlemen to purchase convicts who had been transported for their crimes and employ them as private tutors in their families ?" (Pp : 17-19).

Our aristocracy and moneyed classes are charged,

* England in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. IV, p. 18.

† ,, ,, ,, p. 34.

‡ "Had education 'permeated throughout' England when the foundations of popular liberty were laid ?" (*India*, April 19th, 1907). Every student of Englis history knows that in England the wide spread of popular education followed but did not precede popular Government.

and justly in most cases, as lacking in public spirit. That they spend their time in idleness and worthless pursuits cannot be denied. But the aristocracy of America were no better. Their gentlemen class consisted of planters and farmers, regarding whom Adams writes :—

"The lands are cultivated and all sorts of trades are exercised by negroes or by transported convicts, which has occasioned the planters and farmers to assume the title of gentlemen, and they hold their negroes and convicts—that is, all labouring people and tradesmen—in such contempt, that they think themselves a distinct order of beings. Hence they never will suffer their sons to labour or learn any trade but they bring them up in idleness or, what is worse, in horse-racing, cock-fighting, and card-playing ... . The object of the men of property here, the planters, &c., is universally wealth. Every way in the world is sought to get and save money ; land-jobbers, speculators in land, little generosity to the public, little public spirit." (Adams' Works, II, 436).

But the Indian people at present, on the whole, are angels compared to the Colonists of America, who were brutalised by their dealing in slaves and permitting slavery. They presented the spectacle of degraded humanity. Lecky writes :—

"The most serious evil of the colonies was the number and force of the influences which were impelling large classes to violence and anarchy, brutalising them by accustoming them to an unrestrained exercise of power, and breaking down among them that salutary respect for authority which lies at the root of all true national greatness. The influence of negro slavery in this respect can hardly be overrated, and in the slave States a master could commit any act of violence and outrage on a negro with practical impunity.

"... ... White men planted among savages and removed from the control of European opinion seldom fail to contract the worst vices of tyrants.

"... ... ... Juries in [Red] Indian cases could never be trusted, and public opinion on the frontier looked upon [Red] Indians as little better than wild beasts. ... ... But the despatches of Johnson and Stuart are full of accounts of how the English settlers continually encroached on the territory which was allotted by treaty to the Indians ; how the rules that had been established for the regulation of the Indian trade were systematically violated, raders of the lowest kind went among the savages, keeping them in a state of continual drunkenness till they had induced them to surrender their land, how the goods that were sold to Indians were of the most fraudulent description ; how great numbers of Indians who were perfectly peaceful, and loyal to the

English, were murdered without a shadow of provocation; and how these crimes were perpetrated without punishment and almost without blame."*

If those colonists who were brutalised by permitting slavery amongst them were worthy of liberty, why should not the inhabitants of India where no institution like that of the slavery of the colonies ever existed be considered worthy of the same? Liberty alone befits a people to enjoy liberty.

What awakened the American colonists from their state of lethargy, and who were the mouth-pieces to give expression to their discontent? Perhaps it is not so well known, but it should be widely known, in India, that it was the lawyers, the members of the legal profession, who helped to give voice to the discontent with which American society was seething. The most intelligent men amongst the colonists took to the study of the law. Burke said:—

"In no country, perhaps, in the world, is the law so general a study. The profession itself is numerous and powerful, and in most provinces it takes the lead. The greater number of the deputies sent to Congress were lawyers. ... ... I have been told by an eminent bookseller that in no branch of his business, after tracts of popular devotion, were so many books as those on the law exported to the plantation."

Noah Webster wrote in 1787:—

"Never was such a rage for the study of law. From one end of the continent to the other the students of this science are multiplying without number. An infallible proof that the business is lucrative."

Men like Jefferson, Adams, Otis, Dickenson and others, belonged to this profession.

Do we not see the same thing happening in India? The best men of our universities belong to the legal profession. Most of the delegates returned to the Indian National Congress, and members of the public bodies and assemblies of this country are lawyers. The legal profession is so much in evidence everywhere in India that our Anglo-Indian rulers and newspapers tauntingly refer to the present state of

* Lecky's History of England, Vol. IV, p. 35.

India as 'Vakil Raj.' The members of the legal profession should take this as a compliment and strive to give expression to the discontent that is prevalent in India as did Otis, Jefferson and others in America on the eve of the emancipation of the colonies. They should also try to create and direct public opinion in this country. *

The implements of peace are more effective than weapons of war. The author of "National Life and National Character" says :—

"The supremacy of the inferior races in the future is likely to be achieved by industrial progress rather than by military conquest." †

Yes, in the spread of the Swadeshi movement binding all the inhabitants of India to abstain from foreign manufactures, as far as possible, lies the salvation of this country.

As we have said before, the colonists of America were, on the eve of the Revolution, no better, nay worse, than the Indians of to-day. There were many colonists who were averse to throw off the yoke of England and assume independence. What were their reasons ? Lecky writes :—

"Was it not likely, too, that an independent America would degenerate, as so many of the best judges had predicted, into a multitude of petty, heterogeneous, feeble, and perhaps hostile States ? ... ... Was it not possible that the lawless and anarchical spirit which had of late years been steadily growing, ... would gain the upper hand, and that the whole fabric of societd would be dissolved ? ‡

* Lecky writes :—"Few persons except lawyers had any tincture of literature, and lawyers under these circumstances had attained a greater power in this province than in any other part of the king's dominions. They had formed an association for the purpose of directing political affairs. In an assembly where the majority of the members were ignorant and simple-minded farmers, they had acquired a controlling power : ...... They were the chief writers in a singularly violent press. They organised and directed every opposition to the Governor, and they had attained an influence not less than that of the priesthood in a bigoted catholic country. (Lecky's History of England, Vol. IV, p. 19.)

† Pearson's National Life and National Character, p. 99.

‡ Lecky's History of England, Vol. IV, p. 223.

Similar fears are professed by Anglo-Indians and entertained by many of our own countrymen. But the subsequent history of America has proved that these colonists were one and all false prophets. Their predictions have not come to be true. If India be given Home Rule and if no incarnation of Satan, inspired by the doctrine of "*Divide et impera,*" plays mischief in this country, is it not likely that the predictions of the present day Anglo-Indian bureaucrats and journalists also will be falsified ?

M. R., June, 1907.

SELF-RULE IN ORIENTAL COUNTRIES

It was in the early nineties of the last century that, when it was proposed to reconstitute the legislative councils of this country, Lord Salisbury opposed the proposal on the ground that the representative system of Government was unknown in the East. According to him, democracy was not suited to the Eastern races and a system of benevolent despotism is what is good for them. But is it true that the people of oriental countries are and always have been all governed autocratically and that they are groaning under tyrannical despotism ? We have to deal with this question in order to see whether *swaraj* or self-rule in any shape or form existed or exists in the East.......

The Afghans have always possessed self-government in a form which it has been found difficult to stamp out. They are the Highlanders of Asia and their tribal *jirgahs* are so many parliamentary institutions to manage their domestic and foreign affairs. These *jirgahs* are representative bodies. It is because the Afghans have been brought up

under *swaraj* for centuries, that they so strongly resent the interference of foreigners in their affairs. Elphinstone in his "Account of the Kingdom of Caubul" (2nd Edition) wrote :—

"The Afghauns themselves exult in the free spirit of their institutions. Those who are little under the royal authority, are proud of their independence, which those under the King admire and fain would imitate. They all endeavour to maintain, that "All Afghauns are equal," which, though it is not, nor ever was true, still shows their notions and their wishes. I once strongly urged to a very intelligent old man of the tribe of Meeankhail, the superiority of a quiet and secure life, under a powerful monarch, to the discord, the alarms and the blood, which they owed to their present system. The old man replied with great warmth, and thus concluded an indignant harangue against arbitrary power, "We are content with discord, we are content with alarms, we are content with blood, but we will never be content with a master."—Vol. 1, p. 279.

Can anything be a clearer indication of the working of the spirit of *swaraj* than the above declaration ? We shall give a few more extracts from Elphinstone's work to give a better idea to the reader of self-government in Afghanistan.

"As each tribe has a government of its own, and constitutes a complete commonwealth within itself, it may be well to examine the rise and present situation of those commonwealths, before we proceed to consider them as composing one State, or one confederacy, under a common sovereign."—Vol, I. p. 253.

"The name of Oolooss is applied either to a whole tribe, or to one of these independent branches. The word seems to mean a clannish commonwealth."—Vol. I. p. 254.

"The Chief of an Oolooss is called Khaun......In some Ooloosses, the Khaun is elected by the people."—Vol. I, p. 255.

"The internal government of the Oolooss is carried on by the Khauns, and by assemblies of the heads of divisions. These assemblies are called Jeergas."—Vol. I, p. 258.

" ...... In matters of importance, when circumstances will admit, the sentiments of the whole tribe are ascertained before anything is decided."—Vol. I, p. 259.

"With the exception of *the republican government of the Ooloosses*, the situation of the Afghaun country appears to me to bear a strong resemblance to that of Scotland in ancient times : ... ."—Vol. I, 277.

"In Afghaunistan, on the contrary, the internal government of the tribes answers its end so well, that the utmost disorders of the royal government never derange its operations, nor disturb the lives of the people. A number of organised and high-spirited republics are ready to defend their rugged country against a

tyrant: and are able to defy the feeble efforts of a party in a civil war."—Vol. I, p. 280.

"In most Ooloosses, the Khauns can levy no taxes, and can take no public measure, without the consent of the *elected* Mulliks, who are obliged, in their turn, to obtain the consent of their divisions. The king might try to strengthen the Khauns, and by their means to draw a supply from a reluctant people, but unless he began with greater means than the kings have yet possessed, his attempt would probably be attended with as little success; and if he wished for general and cordial aid, it must be procured by adherence to the present system, and by obtaining the consent of the nation."—Vol I, p. 282.

The above extracts must convince all unprejudiced readers that the Afghans are used to a representative form of Government.

But it is said that the Afghans are fanatics and cut the throats of those who are not Muhammadans. But is this allegation true? For, if it were true, then no non-Muhammadan could live amongst them, and, there being no liberty for non-Muhammadans, *swaraj* would be a mockery. But Mountstuart Elphinstone in the work cited above thus bears testimony to the tolerance of Afghans towards Hindus:—

"Whatever may be their conduct in war, their treatment of men whom they reckon infidels, in their own country, is laudable in Mahomedans. Their hatred to idolaters is well known; yet the Hindoos are allowed the free exercise of their religion, and their temples are entirely unmolested; though they are forbidden all religious processions and all public exposing of their idols. The Hindoos are held to be impure, and no strict man would consent to eat meat of their dressing; but they are not treated with any particular contempt or hardship: they are employed in situations of trust and emolument, and those who reside in Afghaunistan appear as much at their ease as most of the other inhabitants."—Vol. I, pp. 317-318.

"They are often employed about the court, in offices connected with money or accounts; the duty of steward and treasurer about every great man is exercised either by a Hindoo or a Persian. There have even been Hindoo governors of provinces, and at this moment the great Government of Peshawar has been put into the hands of a person of that religion. .... I have mentioned the degree of toleration which the Hindoos meet with, and have only to add, that many of them are in very good circumstances and that they possess the best houses in every town, if we except the palaces of the nobilty."—Vol. I, p. 503.

The religion of Islam in its origin, in its development and in its progress has been saturated through

and through with the spirit of democracy. Wherever it has found its home, it has favored the doctrine, if not of the brotherhood of man, at least, of the brotherhood of the members of its own creed. So democracy is quite suited to the countries which believe that God is One and Mahomed was His Prophet.

That island in the Far East, that Land of the Rising Sun, Japan, has shown what progress can be achieved in all departments of human activity within less than half a century, if a country is given the boon of *Swaraj*. It is only half a century since the Japanese Parliament came into existence. But within that short period what a revolution it has wrought in the politics of the world.

China is also awakening, and at a not very distant future, with her Parliament, and well-trained army and with the industrial development of the country, she is sure to command the respect of the other nations of the world. That will be the day of the real "yellow peril." Mr. Pearson in his work on "National Life and National Character," wrote that "the military aggrandisement of the (Chinese) empire, which would provoke general resistance, is in fact, less to be dreaded than its industrial growth, which other nations will be, to some extent, interested in maintaining."

But what if owing to the new spirit which is abroad, China becomes a great military power as well as a nation of shop-keepers like England? Then no Western poet will sing :—

"Better forty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay."

In the beginning of this twentieth century, some Western nations conspired against China. The torrents of blood which they shed, the ill-treatment of the people of the country, irrespective of their age, sex and position in life, and the vandalism which they practised have opened the eyes of the Chinese. The Chinese being practically a homogeneous nation must be considered fit for Parliamentary institutions even by those Europeans who believe or profess to

do so, that homogeneity is absolutely necessary for representative government, which is not a fact. That such institutions will be a success will be quite evident from the past history of China. The question arises, "Is the great continent of India alone unfit for *Swaraj* and representative institutions? What, after being under the tutelage of England for a century and a half, is she alone of all countries in the East unfit to enjoy the privileges of *Swaraj*?" Every schoolboy knows that before England had set her foot on the Indian soil, village communities flourished in this land—nay, this land was the home and cradle of those communities. Did not these village communities represent democratic and representative institutions? But English rule has tolled the death-knell of those communities. The rule of England has destroyed most of our institutions good, bad and indifferent. No wonder then that at present Englishmen believe that our capability for self-government does not perhaps exist. Says Seeley in his "Expansion of England":—

> "India then is of all countries that which is least capable of evolving out of itself a stable government. And it is to be feared that our rule may have diminished what little power of this sort it may have originally possessed. For our supremacy has necessarily depressed those classes which had anything of the talent or habit of government."

That we once possessed free and representative institutions can be proved to demonstration. Elphinstone says in his *Account of the Kingdom of Caubul*:—

> "There are traces in the village government of India, of the existence of a system resembling that of the Afghaun Ooloosses; the remains of it, which have survived a long course of oppression, still afford some relief from the disorders of the government, and supply the solution of a difficulty, which must be experienced by all travellers in the centre of India, respecting the flourishing state of parts of the country, from which all government appears to be withdrawn."—Vol. I, p. 284.

So it is clear that these village republics were so strong and so firmly rooted in the soil that even in the midst of anarchy they were prosperous. But it

is not our ancient village communities alone that show that we have the instinct of self-government. Our caste brotherhoods are democratic institutions and our joint families are democratically conducted. Some people might be disposed to consider it a long leap from domestic government to the government of a State. But as Tacitus says, "Domestic rule is more difficult than the government of a kingdom." And it is not unreasonable to think that the government of the home fits persons for the government of larger aggregations of individuals. For a family is the state in miniature, and in it all the functions of the government have to be exercised by its head: he has to be judge, jury, treasurer, law-maker, etc., in the harmonious management of the household and the orderly bringing up of the children.

That public opinion existed and was respected by the kings in ancient India has been shown in a previous article. In the same article an authentic instance has been given of an ancient Indian republic. That others, too, existed is clear from the following extract from an article on oriental research in the *Times of India* by Dr. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, who is not a political agitator :—

"The Indian Aryans had, like their European brethren, the rudiments of free political institutions. When Kshatriya tribes settled in a province the name of the tribe in the place became the name of the province, and the Panchalas, Angas, Vangas, Vrijis, etc., collectively became identified with the countries in which they lived. And actually the existence of aristocratic republics is alluded to in Buddhist Pali books. But the rudiments of free political institutions did not grow in India; and no passion for national unity strong enough to trample under foot the germs of caste was developed, while the latter had a very luxuriant growth, with the results that we at present see. Why did the instinct of political freedom and a passion for national unity not grow in India, while they did among the Aryan races of Europe? Probably the cause is to be sought in the rigidly despotic and tyrannical manner in which the conquering Aryas treated the subject races. *One section of a community, especially if it be small, cannot continue to enjoy freedom if it rigidly denies it to the other and larger section*, and cannot have the desire to be united with it by the national tie if it invariably despises the other as an inferior race, and denies it the ordinary rights of man."

Incidentally, Anglo-Indians and other British Imperialists may be asked to reflect on the sentence we have italicised above.

Mr. Vincent A. Smith also says in *The Early History of India* :—

"The Panjab, Eastern Rajputana, and Malwa for the most part were in possession of tribes or clans living under republican institutions............ The reader may remember that in Alexander's time these regions were similarly occupied by autonomous tribes, then called the Malloi, Kathaioi, and so forth." P. 250.

It must, of course, be admitted that just as liberty alone fits men for liberty, so our dependence may make us daily more and more unfit for liberty. We have already lost much ground. But if the natural right of *swaraj* be restored to India, the lost ground will be recovered, and in a very short time our countrymen will be able to properly administer their own affairs. If England be true to all the pledges which she had in the name of her people and sovereign solemnly given to India, she should not hesitate to restore the right of *swaraj* to India without any further delay.

M. R. June, 1907.

IS PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT SUITED TO INDIA ?

Parliamentary Government has proved a great success in the West. But this form of Government is said to be unsuited to India.

During the recent Indian Budget debate in the House of Commons, Earl Percy is reported to have "repudiated the possibility of Parliamentary institutions in India.' Mr. Settled-fact Morley also is re-

ported to have said: "One of the most difficult experiments ever tried in human history, was the attempt to ascertain whether they could carry on personal government along with free speech and free right of public meetings," the clear implication being that nothing but personal government was possible in India. As we are of opinion that representative government is quite practicable in India, that a successful beginning in this direction may and ought to be made at once and that no other form of government can give peace, prosperity, contentment and strength to India, it seems necessary to examine the question in some detail.

The arguments which have been advanced by those who are opposed to the grant of any form of self-government to India are, besides some of those examined before, mainly the following:—

1. India is merely a geographical expression, because the many races that inhabit it have not attained any measure of homogeneousness, and so this form of administration is not feasible.

We have tried to show in a previous paper that the country which is now known as the United States of America was not more fit for self-government when the colonists threw off the yoke of England than India is to-day. Perhaps it will be more correct to say that India is better prepared for self-government than America then was. If self-government and that, too, of a republican type, has proved a success in America, we do not see any reason why it should not in India also.

We have shown in the above-mentioned paper that the United States of America are not even at the present day homogeneous as regards race, religion and language. Canada is not homogeneous, nor is the Transvaal, which enjoy self-government of a representative type. Representative government prevails in Austria-Hungary. But the people there are of many races and follow many creeds. The Teutonic race predominates in the west and southwest, and Germans form about one-fourth of the total population. Slavs form nearly half the popu-

lation : Czechs in Bohemia and Moravia, Poles in Galicia, Croats in Croatia and Dalmatia. About 3½ millions are of Romanic race,—Roumanians in Transylvania, and Italians in the Southern Tyrol and on the Adriatic Coast. The Magyars, a distinct race, form about half the population of Hungary. There are also Ruthenians, Slovenians, Serbs, Bulgarians, Ladins, Freulians, Jews, Armenians, Gipsies, and a great variety of other races. As the result of this mixture of races, a variety of languages is spoken, and in most parts of the country at least two languages are in common use. Most of the people are Roman Catholics, but there are Protestants, Jews and members of the Greek Church also. In the small republic of Switzerland, the population is composed of four distinct ethnical elements, following different creeds. The languages spoken are German, French, Italian and Romansch or Ladin. In the Russian Empire the Duma represents the introduction of the representative form of government. In this Empire, there are the Russians (comprising the Great Russians, the Little Russians and the White Russians), Poles, Servians, Bulgarians, Bohemians, Armenians, Kurds, Persians and other Iranians, Jews, Caucasians, Georgians, Circasians, Finns, Karelians, Esthonians, Livonians, Lapps, Samoyedes, the Volga Finns, Ugrians, Tartars, Bashkirs, Kirghizes, Yakuts, Kalmucks, Buriats, Tunguses, Golds, Germans, Swedes, Roumanians, and a considerable number of other races. Besides various forms of Christianity, Buddhism, Islam, Judaism and various forms of animism and paganism prevail in the Russian Empire.

With respect to the homogeneity or heterogeneity of India, it must be remembered that in spite of the various races and sects inhabiting it, indigenous India is, broadly speaking, socially, and spiritually, —in the character of her peoples, one. It is not true, again, that India never attained political unity. Mr. Vincent Smith says in his *Early History of India* (p. 6) that in the reigns of Asoka and Samudra Gupta "the political unity of all India was nearly

attained." Other princes, too, in his opinion, "might fairly claim to rank as paramount powers." Aurangzib nearly succeeded in making India politically one.

As for India being a mere geographical expression, it would be interesting to learn what great country in Europe has been otherwise, a few decades or centuries ago, and politically one for centuries past. The small bit of land called England had its heptarchy or seven kingdoms. Wales and Scotland and Ireland also were divided into separate hostile countries. The Highlands of Scotland contained many clans constantly engaged in fighting against one another. Similar was the state of things in Ireland. France was not one, nor Spain, Germany, Italy, Greece, Austria or Russia.

2. Another reason for denying self-government to India is that public spirit is wanting in this country. But we maintain that there is sufficient public spirit existing in the country to make self-government a success. If we turn to the history of England we find that there have been many periods in the history of that nation when there was the decline of public spirit, but nevertheless parliamentary government existed. Referring to the decline of public spirit in the middle of the eighteenth century in England, Mr. Lecky says :—

"The fault of the time was not so much the amount of vice as the defect of virtue, the general depression of motives, the unusual absence of unselfish and disinterested action." *

We will quote the same author at some length to tell the story of the decline of public spirit that had set in in England in the middle of the Eighteenth Century. He writes :—

"The long war which began in 1739 failed signally to arouse the energies of the nation. It involved no great principle that could touch the deeper chords of national feeling. It was carried on chiefly by means of subsidies. It was one of the most ill-directed, ill-executed, and unsuccessful that England had ever waged, and the people, who saw Hanoverian influence in every

* History of England in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II, p. 91.

campaign, looked with an ominous supineness upon its vicissitudes. Good judges spoke with great despondency of the decline of public spirit as if the energy of the people had been fatally impaired. Their attitude during the rebellion of 1745 was justly regarded as extremely alarming. It apeared as if all interest in those great questions which had convulsed England in the time of the Commonwealth and of the Revolution had died away—as if even the old courage of the nation was extinct. Nothing can be more significant than the language of contemporary statesmen on the subject. 'I apprehend,' wrote old Horace Walpole when the news of the arrival of the Pretende. was issued, 'that the people may perhaps look on and cry "Fight dog! fight bear" if they do no worse.' 'England,' wrote Henry Fox, 'Wade says, and I believe, is for the first comer, and if you can tell whether the 6,000 Dutch and ten battalions of English, or 5,000 French and Spaniards will be here first, you know our fate.' 'The French are not come—God be thanked! But had 5,000 landed in any part of this island a week ago, I verily believe the entire conquest of it would not have cost them a battle.' 'Your Lordship will do me the justice,' he writes, 'to believe that it is with the utmost concern I have observed a remarkable change in the dispositions of the people within these two years; for numbers of them, who, during the apprehensions of the last invasion, appeared most zealous for the Government, are now grown absolutely cold and indifferent, so that except in the persons in the pay of the Government and a few Dissenters, there is not the least appearance of apprehension or concern to be met with. As an evidence of this truth, your Lordship may observe the little influence an actual insurrection has had on the public funds, and unless some speedy stop be put to this universal coldness by satisfying the demands of the nation and suppressing by proper laws that parliamentary prostitution which has destroyed our armies, our fleets, and our constitution, I greatly fear the event.' The Government looked upon the attitude of the people simply as furnishing an argument for increasing the standing army,......" *

The remedy which Henry Fox proposed for the cure of the decline of public spirit in England is also the remedy which will infuse new life in the Indian nation. Henry Fox wanted that "speedy stop be put to this universal coldness by satisfying the demands of the nation." Yes, this should be done in the case of India also.

3. Then, again, it is said, that venality and corruption is a national vice in India and, therefore,

* Lecky's History of England in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II, pp. 86-88.

self-government instead of being a boon will be a great curse to the people. Of course, we deny the charge so wantonly indulged in by charitable Europeans that venality is a national vice in India. But why do they forget the extreme corruption of the English Parliament that existed even a century ago ? Every school-boy knows of the rank corruption that grew luxuriantly in all the national concerns of England. Lecky writes :—

"The question in home politics, which excited most interest in the nation [in the eighteenth century] was one which or very obvious reasons, Parliament desired as much as possible to avoid. It was the extreme corruption of Parliament itself, its subserviency to the influence of the executive, and *the danger of its becoming in time rather the oppressor than the representative of the people.* ' *

The words put in italics need no comment. Yet the representative system of government was not abolished, although there was extreme corruption of Parliament. The same author says :—

"It is not easy to understand how a parliament so thoroughly vicious in its constitution, so narrow, corrupt, and often despotic in its tendencies as that which I have described, should have proved itself, in any degree, a faithful guardian of English liberty, or should have produced so large an amount of wise, temperate, and tolerant legislation as it unquestionably did.' †

Every one knows what frightful corruption exists in the United States of America even in our days. So we need not dilate on it.

Mr. Lecky is right in saying that

"Statesmanship is not like poetry, or some of the other forms of higher literature, which can only be brought to perfection by men endowed with extraordinary natural genius. The art of management, whether applied to public business or to assemblies, lies strictly within the limits of education, and what is required is much less transcendent abilities than early practice, tact, courage, good temper, courtesy, and industry.

"In the immense majority of cases the function of statesmen is not creative, and its excellence lies much more in execution than in conception. In politics possible combinations are usually few,

* Lecky's History of England in the 18th Century, Vol. II, pp. 44-45.

† *Ibid*, p. 65.

and the course that should be pursued is sufficiently obvious. It is the management of details, the necessity of surmounting difficulties, that chiefly taxes the abilities of statesmen, and these things can to a very large degree be acquired by practice........Imperfect and vicious as was the system of parliamentary government, it at least secured a school of statesmen quite competent for the management of affairs."

Mr. Morley is reported to have said in his last Budget speech that Indians "were incapable of working the elaborate machine of the Indian Government." The above extract from Lecky is a sufficient theoretical refutation of Mr. Morley's groundless and absurd generalization. Even school-boys can recount the names of the great statesmen of ancient, mediaeval and modern India in practical refutation of this slander of a whole nation. If India be given a start in the parliamentary system of government, is it too much to say that what was achieved in England when Parliament was notoriously corrupt, will also be equally achieved in India? 'If the English Parliament was a faithful guardian of English liberty,' an Indian Parliament will also play a similar part in India.

4. One of the common arguments which one is sick of hearing against the grant of the boon of self-government to India is that education has not made much progress in the country and that nearly 90 per cent. of the population being illiterate, it is not possible for them to carry on the system of self-government. Those who advance such an argument may be charged with cant and hypocrisy. To wait till the day when illiteracy shall be swept away from the length and breadth of a country and then to grant it self-government resembles the attitude of the boy on the banks of a river who waited to cross it when it would become dry by the flowing away of all its waters. Did illiteracy disappear largely from England before Parliamentary Government made its appearance in that land? Even now voters need not have any educational qualification in England, as illiteracy does not disqualify anybody from the enjoyment of the franchise. Compulsory and

free education came into vogue in England only a few decades ago, and yet that country has enjoyed Parliamentary Government for centuries when very few people could read and write. Besides, the hypocritical bureaucrats who bring forward this argument are themselves responsible for keeping India illiterate. But even illiterate castes in India manage their own caste affairs quite efficiently according to representative methods in their own 'panchayets.'

5. Another argument is that the English system of party government being inapplicable to India, she cannot have representative institutions. If the official party be beaten, are the English to retire from India, leaving the government to be carried on by the non-official Indian majority? The extremists will say, let them. The moderates will say, not necessarily; let the Viceroy, like the English king, belong to no party. There is among non-official Indians themselves sufficient difference of opinion to allow of the formation of two parties. If there can be and is party government in the colonies, under British suzerainty, why not here?

The educated Indians who ask for Self-government are taunted as being a 'microscopic minority.' But why this fling at the 'microscopic minority'? In English history, nay, in the history of the world, it has been the 'minority'—perhaps ultra-microscopic, which has always carried out reforms. Says a great thinker:

"All that has made England famous and all that has made England wealthy, has been the work of minorities, sometimes very small ones." (Sir H.S. Maine's Popular Government, p. 88.)

Aye, 'the microscopic minority' is sure to swell into a 'macroscopic' majority if equal opportunities are placed within their reach.

In our article on "Swaraj or Self-rule in Oriental Countries," we have shown that in India and other eastern countries democracy is not a new thing. That disposes of the argument that we are fit to have only a "benevolent despotism."

So we see how unsound and untenable are all the

arguments which have been advanced against granting the boon of self-government or Parliamentary Government to the people of India. Those arguments will hardly bear the test of examination. We naturally arrive at the conclusion that it is liberty alone which befits a people to enjoy it and if the people of India are given 'swaraj', they are sure not to abuse its privileges.

But admitting, which we do not, that India being inhabited by different races speaking different languages, representative institutions cannot be granted to her as a whole, what stands in the way of dividing India into Provinces which are for all practical purposes racially and linguistically homogeneous, giving these divisions representative assemblies and converting the whole country into a Federation of Self-governing States? For instance, Bengal proper is racially and linguistically one, the Musalmans for the most part being of Hindu origin. The whole of the Hindustani-speaking tracts may also be constituted a self-governing state. Similar treatment may be accorded to other divisions on the linguistic basis. Of course it may not be practicable to follow the language basis throughout India. But other bases are available. It will no doubt be objected that Hindu-Musalman relations are a difficulty. But their relations are generally cordial when these religious communities are left to themselves. Animosities are often created by interested officials and their toadies. But taking the worst view of the situation, have Hindus and Musalmans ever treated one another worse than Roman Catholics and Protestants have done in England and other European countries? Have they ever burnt one another alive? Have Hindu-Musalman riots been more sanguinary than No-Popery riots, anti-Jewish riots, the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacres, etc.? In the United States of America, particularly in the South, cases of lynching of Negroes are not even now rare. But will Englishmen propose that for that reason Americans

should be enslaved ? If in spite of religious animosities, riots and massacres, representative institutions have flourished in European countries, why should not they in India ?

M. R., July, 1907.

SELF-GOVERNMENT AND GOOD GOVERNMENT

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman has laid it down that good government can never be a substitute for self-government. Many people wonder why. Evidently they do not understand the ideal and object of democracy. These are explained in an admirable manner in an article on "Women and Democracy" in the April (1907) number of the *International Journal of Ethics*, from which we give a few extracts below :—

In fact the supporters of democracy might well be divided into two classes : those who look to it merely as a barrier against oppression and idleness, and those who hold over and above all this, that even an ideal despotism, where there was no idleness and no oppression, would in itself be inferior to an ideal democracy simply because it is better that every individual should direct himself rightly than be so directed by others. Those who grasp this ideal of self-government as more than mere good government hold democracy to be something more than a mere political system, as Maine thought it, and its goal more than "la carriere ouverte aux talents," as Napoleon phrased it. Further, this power of self-direction, being a good for man as man, they take as an ideal to be desired for all men alike. This, of course, as has been pointed out again and again, is the true meaning of the demand for "equality" : it is not the ridiculous fancy that every one has equal abilities, but the conviction that every one's self-development, whatever their abilities may be, is in itself to be taken as of equal importance. No one can have a special "right" to self-development and self-direction any more than to the enjoyment of pleasure or the exemption from pain.

Self-direction, then, like all other ultimate goods, like the rest of virtue and like happiness, must be shared, so far as possible, between all men alike, and every man if he forgets this need of sharing is lacking in his duty. But how far is it possible? Here, for practice, come the crucial questions that divide modern political thought. All men, plainly, are not capable of self-direction in the same degree; why, then, should we give them the same powers? No doubt it would be a desirable thing for everybody to develop a sense of beauty, but that is no reason why we should encourage every tyro to exhibit his daubs. But to this the democrat answers that life in a society is not, at any rate not in the modern world, a craft like painting, to be taken up or laid aside at the individual's discretion. It is, practically, forced upon us all. So complex and closely inwoven have social activities come to be that none of us can move a step without affecting the rest.

No doubt the details of political action must be settled by experts, but every broad question of right and wrong, touching as it does the lives of all individuals, must come up for settlement before them, on pain of stopping their growth. The line may be hard to draw, in fact many of the hardest problems in constructive statesmanship gather round it, but still the main principle is clear. It is no answer to say that the individuals will often decide wrongly; of course they will; the vital question is whether it is not worse for them to give up the attempt to decide at all and so be left like puppets to the opinion of others.

As regards the objection that "the individuals will often decide wrongly" it is also necessary to bear in mind that emperors and kings, autocrats and bureaucrats, also often decide wrongly; no one is infallible.

M. R., August, 1907.

THE STRONGER AND WEAKER RACES OF INDIA

In the course of the Budget Debate Earl Percy stated two facts in which, according to him, lay the impossibility of granting Parliamentary institutions to India. The second fact is

that in this congeries of races Nature had chosen to assign all the qualities which made for physical predominance to the races which were neither intellectually the most versatile nor the lar-

gest in point of numbers. And the result was, as it seemed to him, that any attempt to govern India on the principle of government by majority must lead to a government of the strong by the weak, a government which could not exist for a day except by the support of British bayonets.

By the stronger races he evidently means the races *allowed* to enlist in the army. We have shown in an article in our last number that the Marathas, for instance, are not now enlisted in the army, though they are undoubtedly a fighting race and intellectually quite the equal of any Indian race. As for the Sikhs, let them have the advantages of English education for as long a time as the Bengalis, for instance, and they are sure to show what stuff they are made of. Englishmen themselves admit that their rule has in India the tendency to deprive warlike races of their martial instincts (though curiously enough English rule does not produce this effect in Great Britain) :

"And undoubtedly the more southern and eastern races of India have each in turn lost their martial instincts, as security to life and property due to British rule has rendered reliance on their own arms unnecessary." "The Best Method of Recruiting the Indian Armies," p. 261, *Journal of the United Service Institution of India*, July, 1897.

Besides, in Austria-Hungary and other countries inhabited by various races, which are certainly not of equal mental calibre or equal in number, parliamentary institutions prevail. And then, is it everywhere the fighting and physically strong races or elements of the people that govern ? The Highlanders of Scotland are believed to be the best soldiers in Great Britain. Earl Percy will certainly be able to enlighten us as to the proportion which Highlanders have furnished to the ranks of British cabinet ministers during the present and past centuries.

M. R., August, 1907.

[The distinction between the "writers" and the "fighters" has been gradually disappearing. Moreover, intellect and science at present make more for success in war than mere physical strength.]

OBJECTIONS TO INDIAN HOME RULE

Many of the objections to Indian Home Rule raise false issues. Take, for instance, the question of fitness or unfitness. We are not entirely unfit, are, in fact, as fit to govern ourselves as many self-governing European nations and all Asiatic nations but one. But supposing we are not quite fit, from a righteous point of view is our comparative unfitness any justification of our enslavement? In all countries, there are large numbers of persons who cannot properly manage their estates. But is there any law, any rule of morality, which would justify their abler neighbours in depriving them of their property? Of course, the management of the property of persons who are minors or are otherwise incapable, with a view to its restoration to them when they have become capable, is justified. This is the kind of work which the Court of Wards does. But holding anybody or people in perpetual tutelage is wrong. India has been a ward of England. The time has now arrived for the restoration to India of her right to manage her own affairs. But supposing what is wrong in private life is right in political dealings between nations (which we do not in the least admit), why does not some leading European power deprive Spain, Greece, the Balkan States, or Turkey of independence? None of these countries possess as much political capacity as the most advanced European states. But the charge of unfitness brought against us may after all be a reference to the basal fact of our military unfitness, the fact, namely, that we are no match for any of the great European powers in military strength. This is quite true. But this, again, is no *moral* justification of our being kept in a state of dependence. There are many European nations which cannot fight a first-

class power. Why does not a first-class power enslave them ? The reason is they are Christians, and *white-skinned*, and, therefore, other *white-skinned* Christian races would object ? But why not enslave Persia, or Afghanistan, or Turkey, or China ? They cannot surely fight any great European power ; nor are they Christians.

M. R., September, 1907.

GOOD GOVERNMENT AND SELF-GOVERNMENT

Some people talk as if good government were possible without self-government. *It is not possible.* For, what is good government ? It is that kind of government which has for its *sole* object the material and moral welfare of the people of a country. And in the nature of things foreign autocracy or bureaucracy cannot have such an object. For one thing, it must be more costly than self-government, and, therefore, economically injurious, if not ruinous. But even if it be not economically injurious, it must be morally harmful. For just as that kind of education is the best which enables the pupil to instruct himself, make himself an original thinker and discoverer and develop his manhood, so that kind of government is the best which enables the people to govern themselves and to grow up to their full intellectual and moral stature. But under an autocracy or bureaucracy they are doomed to everlasting tutelage, and intellectual and moral mediocrity. For, if they be allowed to grow up to their full height, foreign domination is threatened : and no conquering nation [except America in the Philippines] has as yet proved sufficiently un-

selfish to welcome such a contingency. Therefore, not only can good government never be a substitute for self-government, as Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman says, but the former is impossible without the latter.

M. R., September, 1907.

DEMOCRACY AND THE MULTIPLICITY OF RELIGIOUS SECTS IN INDIA

It is very often said that democracy is not suited to India because it is inhabited by people of different creeds and religious sects. This argument is made use of by the people of Christian countries from the experience they have had in their own countries. In those countries, secularisation of politics is a thing not many centuries old. Because in Europe members of different denominations used to persecute one another, hence they argue that such must be the case in other countries also whose inhabitants are not composed of one religious sect. But the natives of India have been always comparatively tolerant. India should not be judged by the standard of the Christian countries and Christian nations of the West. The great German thinker and philosopher Schopenhauer has very truly observed :—

"In comparison with the Christian centuries that followed, the ancient world was undoubtedly less cruel than the Middle Age, with its deaths by frightful torture, its countless burnings at the stake; further, the ancients were very patient, thought very highly of justice, and frequently sacrificed themselves for their country, showed traits of magnanimity of every kind, and such genuine humanity, that up to the present time, an acquaintance with their doings and thoughts is called the study of Humanity. Religious wars, massacres, inquisitions as well as other persecutions, the extermination of the original inhabitants of America and the introduction of African slaves in their place. were the fruits of Christianity, and among the ancients one

cannot find anything analogous to this, anything to counterpoise it.......

"Think of the fanaticism, of the endless persecutions, the religious wars, that sanguinary frenzy of which the ancients had no idea; then think of the Crusades, a massacre lasting two hundred years, and perfectly unwarrantable, with its war-cry, *It is God's will*, so that it might get into its possession the grave of one who had preached love and endurance; think of the cruel expulsion and extermination of the Moors and Jews from Spain; think of the massacres, of the inquisitions and other heretical tribunals, the bloody and terrible conquests of the Mohammedans in three different parts of the world, and the conquests of the Christians in America, whose inhabitants were for the most part, and in Cuba entirely, exterminated; according to Las Casas, within forty years twelve million persons were murdered—of course, all *in majorem Dei gloriam*, and for the spreading of the Gospel, and because, moreover, what was not Christian was not looked upon as human.............

"As a matter of fact, intolerance is only essential to monotheism; an only god is by his nature a jealous god, who cannot permit any other god to exist. On the other hand, polytheistic gods are by their nature tolerant: they live and let live; they willingly tolerate their colleagues as being gods of the same religion, and this tolerance is afterwards extended to alien gods, who are, accordingly, hospitably received, and later on sometimes attain even the same rights and privileges; as in the case of the Romans, who willingly accepted and venerated Phrygian, Egyptian, and other foreign gods. Hence it is the monotheistic religions alone that furnish us with religious wars, persecutions, and heretical tribunals, and also with the breaking of images, the destruction of the idols of the gods; the overthrowing of Indian temples and Egyptian colossi, which had looked on the sun three thousand years; and all this because a jealous God had said: "*Thou shalt make no graven image.*"

Schopenhauer has placed Muhammadanism also on the same level with Christianity as having caused bloodshed in the world. That may have been so in other parts of the world, but certainly not so generally in India *under Musalman rule*. When the Muhammadans settled in India as rulers, they generally showed regard for the religious susceptibilities of their Hindu subjects. Much of the proselytising zeal and fanaticism of the followers of the Crescent had disappeared when they came to India. This was mainly due to Islam being tempered with Sufism, which is allied to Vedantism. Sufism is another aspect of Vedantism. Most of the Persian poets

were Sufis, and Muhammadans having settled in India were indirectly influenced by the teachings of the Vedanta, for no one living in India can avoid its subtle influence. Says Max Muller :

"This Vedanta spirit pervades the whole of India. It is not restricted to the higher classes...... It lives in the very language of the people, and is preached in the streets and in the forests by mendicant saints."

The English have not come under its influence because they have not settled in India and do not mix with the natives of this country. Just as "conquered Greece conquered her conquerors," so the conquered Hindus had conquered their Muhammadan conquerors by infusing into their minds the spirit of the Vedanta. What is the spirit, what is the teaching of the Vedanta ? It is expressed in the Sanskrit formula *tat tvam asi*, i. e., "Thou art He." Professor Deussen says :—

"The Gospels fix quite correctly as the highest law of morality : 'love your neighbour as yourselves.' But why would I do so, since by the order of nature I feel pain and pleasure only in myself, not in my neighbour ? The answer is not in the Bible (this venerable book being not yet quite free of Semitic realism), but it is in the Veda, is in the great formula '*tat tvam asi*,' which gives in three words metaphysics and morals together. You shall love your neighbour as yourselves,—because you are your neighbour, and mere illusion makes you believe, that your neighbour is something different from yourselves............ And so the Vedanta, in its unfalsified form, is the strongest support of pure morality, is the greatest consolation in the suffering of life and death,—Indians, keep to it !—"

Yes, Indians—whether Hindus or Muhammadans —have always kept to it. And because the Muhammadans came under its influence, they lost their fanaticism and became tolerant. What spirit of catholicity breathes in the poems of the Mahomedan poets ! *

* There is a pretty story in the *Mantiq-ut-taiq* of Farid-ud-din Attar which shews the religious tolerance of the Persian poet. It runs thus : One night the words "I hear" came from the Presence of God. Gabriel said, "There must be some servant of God, calling on Him, a man of pure heart and subdued passion. I must know who he is." The angel sought in vain through the seven

It must be admitted that Aurangzib was a bigot. But then he was an abnormal specimen of a man. He ill-treated his father by making him a captive, murdered his brothers, and sapped the foundation of the Moghul Empire by his unprovoked wars in the Deccan. From a man of his nature, it was too much to expect toleration or good government. However, his bigotry and want of toleration may be accounted for, if we remember the fact that he spent the most impressionable years of his life in Southern India and thus came more or less under the spell of the Portuguese who were notorious for their Inquisition and persecution of the non-Christians. Aurangzib imbibed their spirit. Many a Hindu temple did he demolish and many a Hindu did he cruelly persecute. Regarding his zeal for breaking Hindu temples, one of his Hindu courtiers once said to him :—

"Behold, my lord, the miracle of my house of idol ; when it becomes useless, it becomes the house of God."

This observation of one of his Hindu courtiers made such a deep impression on him, that he gave up the practice of breaking temples and idols.

It is not true then that the Muhammadans made a business of cutting the throats of the Hindus. India is about equal to Europe minus Russia. Period for period, there has never been greater bloodshed in India than in Europe. Until they came under the

heavens, on sea and on land, in the hills and in the plains. At last by the command of God Gabriel went to Rum. There he found the man he sought praying before an idol. "O Thou Source of all good," cried the angel, "unveil to me this mystery. This man is invoking an idol, and Thou in Thy grace answerest him." Then God said, "If from ignorance he has missed the way, shall I who know the way not teach him ? My grace shall plead for his pardon and bring him to the truth."

This is no isolated utterance, as all who have any acquaintance with Persian literature will testify. Over and over again we are told that all who earnestly seek God, whatever be their religion, will find Him. Nor is Mahommedan tolerance a mere matter of theory. It has always been displayed in practice by the best Mahommedan rulers. The Omeyyads might also be said to have carried tolerance to an excess, for they discouraged the conversion of their Christian subjects.—*The Indian People.*

influence of Europeans, Moslem and Hindu were living in comparative peace and harmony and as brothers, because they were all children of the Indian soil. Many a Hindu prince built mosques for the Muhammadans, and this feeling was reciprocated by the latter also. In the United Provinces, which contained the capitals of the Muhammadan sovereigns of India and where anti-Muhammadan feeling should have been very predominant had the Hindus been generally persecuted by Muhammadans, we find Hindu princes catering to the religious needs of their Muhammadan subjects. Thus in Bareilly which was founded by Raja Makaranda Rai, a *Jama Masjid* was erected by that prince for the use of the Muhammadans.

Hindus are well treated by their Muhammadan neighbours in Afghanistan. We know the Afghans are an illiterate class of people and, therefore, given to blood feuds and quarrels. If they were religious fanatics, then there would be nothing to prevent them from polishing off the Hindu inhabitants of Afghanistan in no time. But they do not molest or ill-treat the Hindus.

The fact is that Europeans judge others by their own standard. They imagine that the votaries of one creed would behave towards those of another creed, as they themselves are in the habit of treating non-Christians, or even Christians who do not belong to the same sect as they do. Because they themselves lack toleration, they imagine that others must likewise do the same.

But a homogeneous population in a country is not necessarily an advantage from the point of view of the political progress of that nation. In his "Dialogue on the best form of government," the Right Honorable Sir George Cornewall Lewis, Baronet, M. P., puts the following in the mouth of *Aristocraticus* :—

"It is mainly by the existence of parties powerful enough to secure attention to the interests and arguments of a minority that political improvement is accomplished. Entire unanimity on political questions is in general an evil ; political discord, up to

a certain point, is an advantage to a State. All received opinions on political subjects cannot be right; all existing laws cannot be wise and expedient.......

"Even unity in matters of religion is, for civil purposes, disadvantageous. The existence of various sects is a guarantee for religious liberty, and a protection against religious tyranny and persecution. Nothing, in a political and intellectual point of view, would at present be more beneficial to Italy and Spain than the formation of religious sects, strong enough to resist the dominant Church. If Charles V, Philip II, and Louis XIV, had understood the true interest and duty of a civil ruler, they would, instead of extinguishing religious dissent by force, rather have thrown, like Cadmus, a stone into the midst of the conflicting parties." (P. 42.)

Nature abhors monotony and discord, but loves diversity and harmony. India has been the home of different religions and creeds, but because there was always comparative harmony amongst them, so there was always religious liberty and not much religious persecution. It is because of the existence of this toleration and religious liberty, that it has been possible for India to have given to the world Comparative Philology and Comparative Mythology. Says Sir Henry Sumner Maine :—

"It may yet give us a new science not less valuable than the sciences of language and folk-lore. I hesitate to call it Comparative Jursiprudence, because if it ever exists, its area will be so much wider than the field of law. For India not only contains (or to speak more accurately, did contain) an Aryan language older than any other descendant of the common mother-tongue, and a variety of names of natural objects less perfectly crystallised than elsewhere into fabulous personages, but it includes a whole world of Aryan institutions, Aryan customs, Aryan laws, Aryan ideas, Aryan beliefs, in a far earlier stage of growth and development than any which survive beyond its orders."

It would have been quite impossible for India to have given all these sciences to the world had there been one common religion in this country, as it is in many other lands.

No, varieties of religion do not stand in the way of *swaraj* or self-rule.

Let us now take a specific episode of religious persecution in the history of India. The Sikhs were badly treated and persecuted by the fanatic Mughal Emperor Aurangzib and his effeminate descendants. This accounts for the retaliatory spirit of the Sikhs.

The sect founded by the mild and meek Baba Nanak was forced by circumstances to become a church militant under Guru Govind. Sir John Malcolm in his sketch of the Sikhs, says :—

"Though the Sikhs had already, under Har Govind, been initiated in arms, yet they appear to have used these only in self-defence : and as every tribe of Hindus, from the Brahman to the lowest of the Sudra, may, in cases of necessity, use them without any infringement of the original institutions of their tribe, no violation of these institutions was caused by the rules of Nanak ; which, framed with a view to conciliation, carefully abstained from all interference with the civil institutes of the Hindus. But his more daring successor, Guru Govind, saw that such observances were at variance with the plans of his lofty ambition ; and he wisely judged, that the only means by which he could ever hope to oppose the Muhammadan Government with success, were not only to admit converts from all tribes, but to break, at once, those rules by which the Hindus had been so long chained ; to arm, in short, the whole population of the country and to make worldly wealth and rank an object to which Hindus of every class, might aspire. ... .

"In the character of this reformer of the Sikhs, it is impossible not to recognise many of those features which have distinguished the most celebrated founders of political communities. The object he attempted was great and laudable. It was the emancipation of his tribe from oppression and persecution ; and the means which he adopted, were such as a comprehensive mind could alone have suggested. The Muhammadan conquerors of India, as they added to their territories, added to their strength by making proselytes through the double means of persuasion and force ; and these, the moment they had adopted their faith, became the supporters of their power against the efforts of the Hindus who bound in the chains of their civil and religious institutions could neither add to their number by admitting converts, nor allow more than a small proportion of the population of the country to arm against the enemy. Govind said that he could only hope for success by a bold departure from usages which were calculated to keep those, by whom they were observed, in a degraded subjection to an insulting and intolerant race. 'You make Hindus Muhammadans, and are justified by your laws,' he is said to have written to Aurangzeb : 'now I, on a principle of self-preservation, which is superior to all laws, will make Muhammadans Hindus. You may rest,' he added, 'in fancied security : but beware ! for I will teach the sparrow to strike the eagle to the ground.' A fine allusion to his design of inspiring the lowest races among the Hindus with the valor and ambition which would lead them to perform the greatest actions."

It is true that Guru Govind gave the following injunctions to his followers, "It is right to slay a

Muhammadan wherever you meet him. Employ your constant efforts to destroy the countries ruled by Muhammadans; if they oppose you, defeat and slay them;" but had the Sikhs acted on his injunctions, it is not too much to say, that not a single Muhammadan would have been this day left in the Punjab. Maharajah Ranjeet Singh was never intolerant to the Muhammadans. He appointed Muhammadans to positions of trust and responsibility. The most noted of his ministers was a Muhammadan.

It is often alleged by those who ought to know better, that the Sikhs destroyed the mosques of the Muhammadans. Had this been so, not a single mosque would have been seen in the Punjab to-day. On the other hand, the following instances of Sikh religious tolerance are mentioned by Mr. R. W. Trafford in the Punjab Notes and Queries, Vol. I, p. 61 :—

> "The principal queen of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, lived at Shekhupura (Gujranwala District), where she built a *Masjid* for her Muhammadan subjects. In a similar spirit of liberality a *Masjid* was erected at Botala *Sivala* by a Sikh Sardar."

Aurangzib was no doubt a fanatic Muhammadan king. But even he was so tolerant to the Hindus, that he entrusted them with high and responsible posts for the management of his vast Empire.

That the Hindu revival of the later seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries under Sivaji and his descendants was not due so much to religious as political causes will be evident from the fact that the faithful servants of the Moghul empire, when that empire was in *extremis*, were Hindus and not Muhammadans. For it was the Hindu governors and viceroys who were loyal and exerted their utmost for the safety and greatness of the Moghul Empire. The rise of the Marathas was not a little due to the help accorded to them by the treacherous Moghul Viceroy of the Deccan, the first Nizam-ul-Mulk. When with the assistance and connivance of the Nizam, the Marathas were ravaging the territories then under the

sway of the Moghul Emperor of Delhi, it is recorded in the *Siyar-ul-Mutakherin*, that the Hindu Viceroy of Malwa, named—

"Raja Giri-dhar, who commanded in that country with a small body of troops, would not suffer his country to be ravaged ; and being an officer of character, he engaged Baji Rao several times, after having in vain requested assistance from the capital. His repeated representations to the throne and to the ministers availed nothing, and that brave man, having wasted his small force in endless skirmishes, at last fell himself in one of them."

The Hindu governor of Gujrat was also loyal to the Moghul Emperor. But compare and contrast their conduct with that of the Nizam-ul-Mulk and other Muhammadan viceroys and governors of that period.

Had there been persecution of the Hindus by their Muhammadan rulers, does it not stand to reason that in the hour of need of the latter, they would have one and all conspired against them and tried to throw off their yoke ?

English historians have described Tippoo as almost an incarnation of Satan and very intolerant to non-Muhammadans. If such were the fact, how was it that he suffered a Hindu to be his Prime Minister ? Purneah, the Talleyrand of Mysore, was the Chief Minister, and the country flourished under him.

M. R., October, 1907.

"Reciprocal Throte-cutting by Hindus and Musalmans."

In works of Indian History written by the English, we read that Muhammadans being fanatics were constantly persecuting and cutting the throats of the Hindus. If this were true, then not a single Hindu would have been left alive in India, for the Muhammadan supremacy lasted over something like five hundred years. But this was not true. If we were to search for a parallel, this would be found in the history of Ireland. The English were Protestants and the Irish were Roman Catholics. There has never been much love lost between these two

sects of the Christian creed. But the Protestant English and the Roman Catholic Irish in course of time became friends. The causes that contributed to this end have been thus set forth by Lecky:—

"The decline of religious fanaticism among the Protestants,...... as well as the natural feelings produced by neighbourhood and private friendships, all conspired to this result. Besides this, over a large part of Ireland there were fifteen or twenty Catholics for one Protestant, and it was impossible to carry out such a system as the Penal Code without a perpetual employment of military force. Society cannot permanently exist in a condition of extreme tension, and it was necessary for the members of both religions to find some way of living together in tolerable security. The very features of the Irish character that make it slow to remedy abuses—its careless, easy, good-nature, its good-humored acquiescence in the conditions in which it finds itself—were here of great service, and a lax and tolerant administration gradually mitigated the severity of intolerant laws."*

The above remarks are applicable to India during the Muhammadan period, if we substitute Muhammadan for Protestant and Hindoo for Catholic and Irish in the above.

The British Christians do not make India their home. But far diffierent was the case with the Muhammadans in India. Lord William Bentinck justly observed:—

"In many respects, the Mahomedans surpassed our rule; they settled in the countries which they conquered; they intermixed and intermarried with the natives; they admitted them to all privileges; the interests and sympathies of the conquerors and the conquered became identified. Our policy, on the contrary, has been the reverse of this,—cold, selfish and unfeeling."

It is an abuse of language, it is utterly false to say that the Muhammadans were cutting the throats of the Hindus. The votaries of those two creeds generally lived harmoniously and like brethren.

M. R., December, 1907.

Hindus and Mahomedans of East Bengal in 1839.

The Topography of Dacca by Dr. Taylor, written in 1839 at the instance of the Medical Board at Fort

* Lecky's History of England in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II, 2nd Edition of 1879, p. 311.

William in Calcutta, is a book which amply repays perusal. The amount of scholarship and the spirit of research displayed by the learned author does him credit, considering the times in which he lived and wrote. In those days Mahomedan influence was still strong in the city of Dacca, the line of genuine Nawabs, called the Naib Nazims of Dacca, had not yet become extinct, and the pomp and pageantry of the Moghul Court had not passed into a dream. One feels interested to learn the nature of the relations between the Hindus and the Mahomedans in those times. In chapter ix, page 257 of Dr. Taylor's book, we get a glimpse of them. He says :—

"Religious quarrels between the Hindus and Mahomedans are of rare occurrence. *These two classes live in perfect peace and concord*, and a majority of the individuals belonging to them have even overcome their prejudices so far as to smoke from the same *hookah*."

With the total downfall of Moghul power, and the reduction of both the communities to a position of equality in subjection, one would think that greater amity would prevail among them in these days. If the fact be otherwise, as the authorities allege, there must be some special reason which counteracts this natural tendency. It is certainly a matter worth thinking out.

M. R., June, 1908.

Hindus and Mahomedans in India in the days of John Company.

In our last number we quoted a passage from Dr. Taylor's Topography of Dacca to show the amicable relations which prevailed between Hindus and Mahomedans in Eastern Bengal about 1839, when the book was written. In this number we shall make some further extracts, but from another source, to show that the same happy state of things prevailed all over India, and even beyond it, in countries governed by Mahomedan rulers. The book to which we shall refer is The East India Gazetteer, by Walter Hamilton, published in two volumes in the year

1828, dedicated by permission to the Court of Directors. The materials from which the work was composed were either printed documents, or manuscript records deposited at the India Board, so that it was something in the nature of a semi-official publication. I shall give the passages with the headings of the articles in which they occur.

Hindustan : Open violence produced little effect on so patient a people, and although the Mahomedans subsequently lived for centuries intermixed with Hindus, no radical change was produced in the manners or tenets of the latter ; on the contrary, for almost a century past, the Mahomedans have evinced much deference to the prejudices of their Hindu neighbours, and a strong predilection towards many of their ceremonies (vol I, p. 648).

Rungpoor : The two religions, however, are on the most friendly terms, and mutually apply to the deities or saints of the other, when they imagine that application to their own will prove ineffectual. (vol II, p. 478).

Malabar : When the Portuguese discovered India, the dominions of the Zamorin, although ruled by a superstitious Hindu prince, swarmed with Mahomedans, and this class of the population is now considered greatly to exceed in number all other descriptions of people in the British District of South Malabar. This extraordinary progress of the Arabian religion does not appear (with the exception of Hyder and Tipoo) to have been either assisted by the countenance of the government or obstructed by the jealousy of the Hindus, and its rapid progress under a series of Hindu princes demonstrates the toleration, or rather the indifference, manifested by the Hindoos to the peaceable diffusion of religious practices and opinions at variance with their own (II, 181).

Deccan : There is a considerable Mahomedan population in the countries subject to the Nizam, but those of the lower classes, who are cultivators, have nearly adopted all the manners and customs of the Hindoos (I. 484)

Kelat [The capital of Beluchistan] : The Hindus are principally mercantile speculators from Mooltan and Shikerpoor, who occupy about 400 of the best houses, and are not only tolerated in their religion, but also allowed to levy a duty on goods entering the city for the support of their pagoda (II, 81).

Afghanistan : Brahminical Hindus are found all over Cabul, specially in the towns, where they carry on the trade of brokers, merchants, bankers, goldsmiths and grain-sellers (I, 12).

Cabul : Many Hindus frequent Cabul, mostly from Peshawar; and as by their industry they contribute greatly to its prosperity, they are carefully cherished by the Afghan Government (I, 307).

Candahar : Among the inhabitants he [Seid Mustapha], reckons a considerable number of Hindus (partly Kanoje Brahmins) both settled in the town as traffickers, and cultivating

the fields and gardens in the vicinity........... with respect to religion, a great majority of the inhabitants are Mahomedans of the Sooni persuasion, and the country abounds with mosques, in which Seid Mustapha asserts both Hindoos and Mahomedans worship, and in other respects nearly assimilate. (I, 341).

M. R., July, 1908.

Modern Religious Neutrality of the State in Ancient India.

In his presidential address at the third International Congress for the History of Religions, which met in September, 1908, at Oxford, Sir Alfred Lyall is reported to have said:—

Up to the sixteenth century it was universally held, by Christianity and by Islam, that the State was bound to enforce orthodoxy; conversion and the suppression or expulsion of heretics were public duties. Unity of creed was thought necessary for national unity.

With the two great religions of the East it was different. In Eastern Asia, beyond the pale of Islam, there were no religious wars such as tore the West. They were unknown, the president believed, until Islam invaded India. It may be true that the rule of Asoka was influential in determining the progress of Buddhism, but the rule of the East was that the State did not make itself responsible for the propagation of one form of faith, it was concerned with its own civil and moral order, and was content that different faiths should be held, if they did not conflict with that order. "While in Mohammedan Asia the State upholds orthodox uniformity, in China and Japan the mainspring of all administrative action is political expediency." In China, Buddhism, Taoism and Confucianism are recognised, and only heresies identified with sedition and disloyalty are repressed. In Japan, Buddhism, Confucianism and Shintoism are impartially recognised."

This shows that the modern principle that there should not be any established state church was practised in Ancient India, where the people enjoyed religious freedom and practised religious toleration to an extent which is unknown in most civilized Western countries. In non-religious matters, too, the people had many customary rights which are statutory in the West and were won after great struggles.

M. R., November, 1908.

Great Britain unfit for Self-Government.

We take the following Reuter's telegram from the morning papers :—

London, June 23. Fifty Liverpool schools have been closed owing to fights between the Protestant and Catholic children aided by their mothers.

We think Reuter has made a mistake. These fighting children are certainly Hindus and Mussalmans in disguise, who suddenly dropped down on Liverpool, having travelled thither in fifty air-ships. For, we have been told by Englishmen that India cannot have self-rule because there are religious faction fights here. The converse must also be true, namely, that in a self-governing country there cannot be "religious riots." And as England is self-governing, either Reuter dreamt a dream, or the children, as we have said, were Hindus and Musalmans in disguise.

M. R., July, 1909.

Catholic Bishop stoned !

"(From our own correspondent.)

"*Allahabad*, July 13th, 1910.

"The following telegram appears in the Australian papers dated London, June 29th :

—While the Roman Catholic Bishop of Liverpool was driving to his residence after laying the foundation-stone of St. Alphonso's Chapel, his carriage was stoned by a Protestant mob."

We take the above from the *Indian Daily News*. Perhaps the news-agency which cabled this piece of news to the Australian papers omitted to add that the people of Liverpool had been disfranchised on account of sectarian rancour caused by religious fanaticism. This has certainly taken place, because we have been often told that one of the causes why we cannot have self-government is that we indulge occasionally in (*ir*-) religious riots.

M. R., August, 1910.

Attacks on Jews in Wales.

Anglo-Indian extremist papers and British Tory journals do not fail to remind us every now and then that India cannot have self-government because, among other causes, there are occasional racial riots and religious feuds in this country. We find, however, that when such riots occur in Great Britain the people of the towns or counties concerned are not deprived of the franchise and other civic rights. The latest instance is the attacks on the Jews in South Wales which have assumed serious proportions.

Owing to attacks made on the Jews in South Wales a number of Jewish refugees have arrived at Cardiff. They endured considerable suffering and were frightened out of their lives. Rioting continues at Bargoed and Gilfach. It is described as a guerilla warfare against the police and infantry. Two Jewish shops have been burned at Senghenyod.

The "Daily Telegraph's" special correspondent states that as a result of a lengthy enquiry he is convinced that the tales of extortion are absolutely devoid of truth.—*Reuter.*

We hope none of the papers we have referred to above will call upon the British Government to disfranchise South Wales. *M. R.*, September, 1910.

The Past Relations of Hindus and Musalmans.

Some people are of opinion that as in the past Hindus and Musalmans fought for supremacy, they cannot be friends again, and that even if they can be friends, this can be brought about only by each community forgetting and never referring to its past history. We cannot accept this opinion. There were warring States in Italy and Germany and France, but they are united countries now. The English and Scotch and Welsh fought in days of yore, but now form a united nation. It may be more difficult for Hindus and Musalmans to unite, particularly as interested persons, who are the enemies of both communities, are always actively fomenting disunion between them; but their union is not in the least impossible. In fact on most occasions there is great harmony between them. As to their past, there is no doubt that there is

much in it of which both communities ought to be ashamed; but there is much, too, to be proud of. Musalmans may well be proud of the heroism and Statecraft which enabled them to establish themselves in what was to them at that time a foreign land. They may be proud of their architecture and the other arts which they patronised, encouraged and improved, and proud, too, of the impartiality and tolerence of many of their Kings. Proud, too, they may be of their religion, which influenced the faiths of India to no small extent. But in India they met foemen worthy of their steel. In Asia wherever the Musalman conqueror went, Islam reigned supreme, utterly annihilating the indigenous faiths,—except in India. There after centuries of Moslem rule Hindus still far outnumbered the Musalmans. Nay more, in many conquered provinces Hindus preserved sufficient vitality and elasticity to assert their independence. So neither Hindus nor Musalmans need be ashamed of their past, nor be afraid to refer to it. It is only mean minds that remember past enmities. Noble minds can honour heroism in their antagonists and be friends again. In Modern India Hindu and Moslem interests are one. They have, moreover, common opponents in those persons who try to set them by the ears to keep them all in perpetual bondage.

We do not know of any community in India which has not something to be proud of. Even the least advanced races, namely, the aborigines, may lay claim to uncommon vitality and manhood, seeing that waves after waves of conquest have not been able to sweep them off the face of the earth. And after all they were the earliest masters of India, and when the feeling of patriotism dawns on their minds, they will be able to love their land with love *farthest* brought from out the storied past. So let us all love our common Motherland and strive to glorify her by our life and character.

M. R., April, 1909.

ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE ON THE INDIAN CRISIS

In his peaceful and beautiful home at Broadstone, in Dorsetshire, one of England's keenest explorers, and most resolute seekers after truth, Dr. Alfred Russell Wallace, is spending his last days in good health amongst the scenes he loves and in occupations that keep him in constant touch with nature; —a delightful life! But his mind is still occupied with our great social problems, and his world-wide sympathy with those who suffer and struggle is as ardent as ever.

Confident as to this, I approached him with reference to India, and especially with reference to the wide-spread and passionate longing for self-government. At first he hesitated. 'Many years ago,' he said, 'I knew a good deal about India, but at present my knowledge is limited, and not absolutely fresh.'

'But it is an old question that is now up for judgment,' was my reply. 'It is simply one more instance of a nation "rightly struggling to be free." '

'Yes,' he said, 'and so far as that goes, I am with the Indian patriots, and my full sympathy is with the people of India in their aspirations for self-government.'

'What then as to the attitude of the British Government?' I said. 'That does not seem to be very sympathetic: and, as to that, your knowledge must be fresh enough.'

'Quite so,' he replied, 'and I must say I am surprised and rather disgusted at the weakness and cowardice of John Morley, of whom I had such hopes. One naturally expected from him something akin to sympathy with national aspirations, something at least more liberal than his reference to such aspira-

tions as crying for the moon. The true way to redeem India is to begin at the bottom, to restore the village communities as self-governing bodies, under the supervision of thoroughly seasoned and sympathetic English or Indian inspectors ; to restore to the people their land and to make it inalienable, with all that is upon it. That will make an end of the money-lender and the lawyer."

'But that will take time, probably a long time,' I said, 'especially if "the predominant partner" has to be persuaded. What could be done in the meantime?'

'Well,' he answered, 'considering what we owe to India financially, we might remit the land assessment for some years, to allow the cultivators to rise above perpetual starving point. That, and free irrigation, would probably almost, if not quite, make an end of the chronic famine, which is itself the condemnation of our rule.'

'Then you are in favour of a very large surrender of our rights and rewards as conquerors of India ?' I said.

'Of a total surrender as quickly as is prudent : and I think we ought to rejoice just in so far as India wants self-government and is fit for it. Instead of deprecating it and fighting it, we ought to welcome and help it.'

In parting from my good old friend, I only wished that the breed of 'Fine old English gentleman' were more widely represented on English soil.

John Page Hopps.
M. R., February, 1908.

THE POPULAR ASSEMBLY IN ANCIENT INDIA

The king in ancient India carried on the central government from his capital, assisted by his three councils of *Ritviks*, *Mantris* and *Amatyas*, the last representing all the principal castes, living probably

in the capital town; also by an assembly of courtiers *sabhasada* who were selected from among the people for their high character and sterling virtues; and lastly, by a great Popoular Assembly, consisting of the principal village lords, feudatory chiefs, military officers and the principal representatives of the people living in the town and the provinces, whom the king summoned to meet on very important and extraordinary occasions only, as for instance on the occasion of nominating a successor to the throne. We have got a very interesting account of the functions of this great Popular Assembly in Valmiki's *Ramayana*, which we cannot resist the temptation of reproducing here *in extenso*.

The occasion was that of nominating a successor to the throne of the kingdom of Kosala. King Dasaratha, having become old and decrepit, naturally felt a strong desire to nominate and appoint his successor, and retire from public life. Rama was his eldest son, and according to the law of primogeniture which governed succession in almost all the ruling Indo-Aryan families, he would have ascended the throne, as a matter of course, after the death of his father. But Dasaratha was anxious to see him installed on the throne in his own life-time, and herein arose a difficulty. He was afraid of Kaikeyi, the young and beautiful queen, on whom he doted, and whom he would not, for the life of him, displease. Lest she should press on him the nomination and appointment of her own son, Bharata, in preference to Rama, he wanted to attach to the installation of Rama, the character of popular sanction, instead of making it a matter of personal choice. Accordingly, he consulted his ministers and summoned the great Popular Assembly which was attended by the lords, nobles, feudatory chiefs, and all representative men of the city and country-towns. The king took his seat in the Assembly-hall, and the lords and representatives also seated themselves according to their rank and order, with their faces turned towards the king.

"Then facing the whole court, that lord of earth, the king, resounding all sides as if with thunder, in a mighty voice, echoing and solemn, and like unto the sounds of a kettle-drum, spake words fraught with welfare and capable of creating high rapture, and worthy of the attention of all. And in tones overflowing with royal signs, and mellifluous, and peerless, and surcharged with the sentiment of surprise, the monarch addressed the princes, saying : 'It is known to ye that the people of the spacious empire now governed by me were governed like unto children by those sovereigns that were my predecessors. Now it is my intention to bring welfare unto this entire earth worthy of being rendered happy, which had been governed by all those sovereigns, Ikshvaku and the rest. Following the path trod by my predecessors, I have, heedless of my own happiness, to the best of my power, always protected the people. And under the shade of the white umbrella, I effecting the good of the entire community, have brought decrepitude upon my body. Having lived for a long period, I desire rest for this decrepit frame. Bearing in the interests of the people the heavy burden of duty incapable of being borne by even those that have controlled their senses, and requiring (in the bearer) right royal qualities, I have become fatigued. I, therefore, wish for rest, after, in the interests of the subjects, installing my son, with the permission of all these excellent twice-born ones around me. My worthy son, like unto Purandara himself in prowess—Rama, the conqueror of hostile cities, hath been born, endowed with all my virtues. Him, like unto the moon while in conjunction with the Pushya constellation—the foremost of those maintaining righteousness, the chief of men, will I, in the morning, with a delighted heart install as the heir-apparent* to the throne. And that auspicious elder brother of Lakshmana will make a fit ruler for ye—yea, the very three worlds might consider themselves as having a lord, by possessing him. Through his agency, I shall this day bring about the welfare of the world, and shall renounce my toil by reposing in him the task of government. If what I have devised be meet, and also recommend itself to ye, do ye accord approval to it,—proposing what I am to do besides this, together with the how of effecting it. If I have thought thus, solely because I find delight in it, do ye look about any other way to welfare. Far different is the thought of the dispassionate; and by friction becomes far more efficacious.'

"As the king had said this, the princes exceedingly delighted, seconded him even as peacocks dance at the sight of a mighty mass of clouds showering down rain. Then there arose a pleasant resonance (from the assembly of the potentates) ; and next from the vast concourse inspired with high rapture, arose an echo generated by their voices which seemed to shake the earth. Then,

* Rama was to have been the *de facto* king bearing the burden of the State, while Dasaratha was to remain king only in name during the remaining years of his life.

being in complete possession of the views of that one (the king), versed in morality and interest, the Brahmans and the principal personages of the army, in company with the citizens and the inhabitants of the provinces, took counsel together, and became unanimous—and having again revolved the matter individually in their mind, spoke unto the aged king, Dasaratha, saying—'O king, thou hast become aged. Do thou then install Rama as the heir-apparent to the throne. We wish to behold the exceedingly strong and mighty-armed hero among the Raghus, riding a huge elephant, his countenance underneath an umbrella.' Hearing these welcome words of theirs, the monarch, as if not knowing their minds, asked them,—'Ye have asked for Raghava, soon as ye have heard my speech. This, ye kings (chiefs), raiseth my doubts. Do ye, therefore, speak out your minds truly. Why, while I am righteously governing the earth, do ye wish to see the highly powerful Rama as the heir-apparent?' And those high-souled ones together with the citizens and the inhabitants of the provinces said unto him, 'O King, many are the virtues of thy son, having for their object the welfare of the people. To-day, we will recount unto thee in detail the merits, making even enemies happy, of the meritorious and intelligent (Rama), resembling a celestial. O Monarch, furnished with the choicest qualities, Rama having truth for prowess is like unto Sakra's self; and he towereth above Ikshwaku and all. Rama is the one excellent person among men; and is true and devoted to truth. And in very Rama is established morality with prosperity. Touching the good of the subjects, he is like unto the moon, and in the quality of forgiveness, he is like unto the earth; in intelligence, like unto Vrihaspati; and in prowess like Sachi's lord. He is cognizant of duty, and true in promise,—and honest; and not given to detraction. He is forgiving, and soothing, and sweet-speeched and grateful and of subdued senses. He is pliable to entreaties and staid, and of agreeable carriage, and uncalumniating. Raghava speaketh every one fair, and is of truthful speech. He ministereth unto variously-versed aged Brahmans. It is for this that in this world, his fame and renown and energy go on increasing. He hath mastered all the weapons that are extant among the gods, the Asuras, and human beings. He hath performed his ablutions after having acquired learning, and knoweth the Vedas with their branches. And Bharata's elder brother is a proficient in music. He is the abode of all good, and is saintly, and hath conquered his grief, and is magnanimous. He is lowly unto those twice-born ones that are worthy and are conversant with morality and interest. And when in company with Sumitra's son, he wendeth to the fight with a view of protecting a city or a province, he cometh not back without conquering the foe. And even as a father enquireth after the welfare of his sons, he, returning from the field on horse or elephant, exhaustively and consecutively enquireth after the weal of the citizens, concerning their sons, or their (sacrificial) fire, or their wives, or their servants, or their disciples. And that tiger-like Rama always asketh the

Brahmans: 'Do your disciples tend you?' and Kshatriyas—'Do your disciples always remain mailed?' When calamity befalleth the people, he experienceth excess of sorrow; and on their festal occasions, he rejoiceth even like their own father. He speaketh the truth and is a mighty bowman. He ministereth unto the aged, and hath controlled his senses (passions). He preludes his speech with a smile, and is established in righteousness with his whole soul. He entirely bringeth about good, and he taketh no delight in bandying words after a quarrel. In reasoning in chain, he is like unto the lord of speech himself. His eye-brows are graceful; and his eyes expansive and coppery; and he is like unto the very Vishnu. Like Kama, he is charming unto all by virtue of his heroism, prowess and might. He is ever engaged in protecting the people; and the desire for the good things of the world cannot perturb his mind. He is capable of bearing the burden even of the three worlds,—what then is this earth? Neither his pleasure nor his displeasure ever goeth for naught. He slayeth those that deserve to be slain; but he is never enraged with those that ought not to be slain (*i.e.* the unoffending):—with whomsoever he is pleased, he bestows wealth upon. In virtue of his self-control and other qualities, dear unto the subjects and capable of exciting the delight of mankind, Rama shineth even like the effulgent sun surrounded by his rays. And even that Rama, crowned with such qualities and having truth for his prowess,—like unto a Lokapala, the earth wisheth to have for her lord. By our good luck it is that thy son hath acquired competence in the task of administration; and also by thy good luck it is that Raghava hath been born, endowed with sonly qualities, like unto Marichi's son Kasyapa. The gods, and the Asuras, and men, the Gandharvas, and the Uragas, and the inhabitants, rural and urban, pray for the strength, health and long life of self-knowing Rama. And whether inmates or outsiders, citizens or natives of the provinces, everyone speaks highly of him. Women, old and young, in both the morning and evening, with intent minds, bow down unto all the gods on behalf of the intelligent Rama. Let their desire, O worshipful one, be fulfilled, through thy grace. And we would behold the son of the foremost of monarchs, the foe-destroying Rama, dark-blue like a lotus, installed as the heir-apparent to the kingdom. Therefore, O bestower of boons, it behoveth thee, for the sake of our well-being, with a delighted mind to speedily install thy son furnished with noble qualities resembling the god of gods, and ever intent upon the welfare of the entire community."*

"And when they had raised unto their heads their clasped hands resembling lotuses, the king responding unto them addressed them in welcome words fraught with good: 'Exceedingly pleased am I, and incomparable also is my influence,—because ye wish to behold my dear first-born installed as heir-

* From M. N. Dutt's "Prose English Translation of Ramayana" Book II, sec. iii.

apparent.' Having greeted them thus, the king in their hearing spoke unto Vasishtha, Vamadeva, and other Brahmans, saying—'This is the holy month of Chaitra; and the groves look beautiful with blossoms. Do ye now prepare for the installation of Rama.' When the king paused, there arose a mighty tumult from the multitude. And when it subsided, the lord of men the king, addressed that foremost of ascetics, Vasishtha, saying, 'It behoveth thee, O worshipful sir, to order for things, necessary for the installation of Rama.' "*

Vasishtha did, as commanded by the king. Then the king asked his charioteer, Sumantra, to fetch Rama to the Assembly-hall. On Rama arriving there,

"That entire assembly looked beautiful in his presence, like the cloudless, autumnal sky, crested with stars and planets, in the presence of the moon."

The king then

"addressed his son, well-seated, in these words, saying, 'Born of my eldest wife, worthy of myself, thou crowned with the best qualities, art my worthy son, O Rama, dear unto me. Thou hast by thy virtues drawn unto thyself the hearts of the people; therefore do thou during the conjunction of the moon with the Pushya constellation, receive the office of heir-apparent. Thou art by nature crowned with virtues. Notwithstanding thy great virtues, I will, O son, from affection tell thee what is for thy profit. Practising greater humility, do thou constantly restrain thy senses. Do thou renounce the ills that come through anger and lust. Replenishing thy exchequer and arsenal do thou, acquainting thyself with the state of things personally or otherwise, administer justice and thereby enlist the affection of courtiers and other subjects; for the friends of him that swayeth the earth, pleasing the people to his satisfaction, rejoice even as did the immortals on obtaining ambrosia. Therefore, do thou, O son, disciplining thyself thus address thee to thy task." †

These words were addressed to Rama by the king in the presence of the whole Assembly. Subsequently, he took him to his private chamber, and among other things spoke the following words:

"To-day the subjects in a body have expressed their desire of having thee for their sovereign. Therefore, O son, I will install thee as the heir-apparent." ‡

* Ramayana, Book. II, sec. iii.

† Ramayana, Bk. II, sec. iii.

‡ Ram. Bk. II, sec. vi, 16.

It may be asked here, if the voice of the people counted for anything, why did they, who had already unanimously selected Rama for their sovereign, tamely submit to the command of King Dasaratha unjustly banishing him into the wilderness? The answer is short and simple. The people were thoroughly convinced that Dasaratha was not acting from caprice or like an autocrat in the matter, but that he,—poor king,—was bound, hand and foot, as it were, by the moral obligation he was under to fulfil his promise, *truly* made to Kaikeyi. None would have been happier than Dasaratha himself, if Rama had refused to be banished at the dictates of Kaikeyi. But Rama, noble and truthful that he was, saw the sad predicament in which his father was placed, and at once came to his rescue. Rama considered the value of *truthfulness and filial piety* higher than that of a crown, and he cheerfully sacrificed his crown and his own *self* at the altar of Truth and Filial Piety. Herein lay his real greatness. The people fully appreciated his greatness and wonderful self-sacrifice, and this very appreciation took away the sting, as it were, from their indignation against the king who became more an object of their pity than of their fury. Mark how they talked among themselves over the affair.

"Knowing every kind of enjoyment, that magnanimous one (i. e. Rama) who has tasted of every luxury, *for maintaining the dignity of morality, does not wish to falsify his father's word.*"

They were, however, rightly indignant at Kaikeyi's conduct. She wanted the kingdom for her son Bharata; but with a view to spite her, and also show their devotion to Rama, they were determined to convert it into a desert, and actually followed Rama, with their wives and children, into the wilderness, till Rama gave them the slip and disappeared suddenly. Mark their words:

"Accompanied by our wives and friends will we, like Lakshmana, follow the departing Raghava by the same way that he takes. And leaving aside our gardens and fields and abodes, will we, making the righteous Rama's happiness and misery our own, follow him. Let Kaikeyi possess herself of our deserted mansions,

—deprived of their buried treasures, with their unswept courtyards, robbed of kine and wealth, and shorn of all substance, and filled with dust, and abandoned by the deities—mansions where rats will run from hole to hole, which will neither emit smoke nor contain water, which will not be swept by broomsticks, from which sacrifices and the slaughter of sacrificial beasts, and the offering of oblations, and the recitation of sacred texts, and *japa*, will be absent, and round which will be strewn broken earthenware, as they are on occasions of political commotions, or the occurrence of natural calamities. Let the forest to which Raghava repairs resemble a city, and let this city renounced by us be converted into a wilderness. Inspired by the fear of us, serpents will leave their holes, and beasts and birds the caves of mountains and elephants and lions the forest. Let them occupy the tracts left behind us............Let Kaikeyi reign in this realm, along with her son and adherents; we renouncing our houses, will dwell in the forest with Raghava."* (Bk. II, section 33).

The sacredness which always guarded the person of a woman in the eye of the Indo-Aryans, alone saved Kaikeyi from a violent death at the hands of the indignant populace. An infuriated European mob would either have led her to the guillotine, or hacked her to pieces even in her own bed-chamber.

I do not apologise to my readers for making the above lengthy extracts from the *Ramayana*, inasmuch as they present a vivid picture of the excellent relations that existed in Ancient India, (or, at any rate, the ideas of the excellent relations that ought to exist), between the king and the people, and also furnish a lofty ideal of kingly virtues, which the Indians still hanker after. They also go to show the power of *vox populi* in Ancient India, which, though not supreme, could not yet be trifled with, or disregarded by the Government.

The power of *vox populi* is again witnessed in the *Ramayana*, when Rama, returning from his exile

* This was no mere idle talk. The people actually did what they had said. "On Raghava having left for the forest............the men were deprived of their senses by grief. And in the city, there arose a mighty tumult in consequence of the hurrying of the people, the elephants waxing mad and furious, and the neighing of horses. And the entire city, containing young and old, extremely afflicted, rushed after Rama, like persons oppressed with the heat of the sun rushing towards water." Bk. II, section 40. Such a state of things would not have been possible, if the people were not free to think and act as they liked.

with Sita and Lakshmana, ascended the throne. He was ruling the kingdom with justice and righteousness; yet he felt desirous of knowing what the people actually thought of him and his rule. One day, he asked one of his trusted officers, Bhadra by name, to tell him, if he knew, a bit of the people's mind. Thereupon Bhadra said that the people were exceedingly pleased with his just and benign rule, and they had nothing to complain against his conduct as a ruler of men. But they condemned his conduct in one particular respect, which was none other than the fact of his taking back Sita, and living with her as his royal consort, although she had forcibly been carried away by Ravana, and had to live in Lanka for full ten months, under his complete control. This, according to popular opinion, was a very bad example for the king to set, as what the king did was always regarded as a precedent to be followed by the subjects in similar circumstances. Rama at once understood the drift of the popular talk, and though he believed Sita, in the inmost recesses of his heart, to be a lady of pure and unblemished character, and though her innocence and purity had already been proved by her passing through the ordeal of fire in Lanka, yet he could not help yielding to the popular murmur, and exiled his wife with a view to set to his subjects a noble example of the purity of the Royal family.

Examples from History.

Coming down to comparatively historical times, we find that there were certain kingdoms in India, where the law of primogeniture was not in force. The people elected their own chief who ruled over them either for life, or for a certain number of years, at the expiration of which he had to vacate his office. We have got an account of a democracy like this in Buddhist records, which we cannot do better than reproduce here in Dr. Rhys Davids' words. Says he with regard to the Sakya clan :

"The administrative and judicial business of the clan was carried out in public assembly, at which young and old were alike present in their common Mote Hall (Santhagara) at Kapilavastu. It was at such a Parliament or palaver that King Pasenadi's proposition was discussed. When Ambattha goes to Kapilavastu on business, he goes to the Mote Hall where the Sakyas were then in session. And it is to the Mote Hall of the Mallas that Ananda goes to announce the death of the Buddha, they being then in session there to consider that very matter. A single chief,—how, and for what period chosen we do not know, was elected as office-holder, presiding over the sessions, and if no sessions were sitting, over the State. He bore the title of *Raja*, which must have meant something like the Roman Consul or the Greek Archon." *

There is also an excellent account of the election of an Emperor in Beal's "Buddhist Records of the Western World" (Vol I, pp. 210-212) which we cannot resist the temptation of quoting here. The Emperor was no other than the Emperor Harsha, the hero of Bana Bhatta's well-known work, the *Harsha-charita*.

"The people having lost their ruler, the country became desolate. Then the great minister Po-ni (Bhandi), whose power and reputation were high and of much weight, addressing the assembled ministers said: 'The destiny of the nation is to be fixed to-day. The old king's son is dead. The brother of the prince, however, is humane and affectionate, and his disposition, heaven-conferred, is dutiful and obedient. Because he is strongly attached to his family, the people will trust in him. I propose that he assume the royal anthority; let each one give his opinion on this matter, whatever he thinks.' They were all agreed on this point, and acknowledged his conspicuous qualities. On this, the chief ministers and magistrates all exhorted him to take authority: 'Let the royal prince attend! The accumulated merit and the conspicuous virtue of the former king were so illustrious as to cause his kingdom to be most happily governed...... The opinion of the people, as shown in their songs, proves their real submission to your eminent qualities. Reign then with glory over the land; conquer the enemies of your family; wash out the insult laid on your kingdom, and the deeds of your illustrious father. Great will be your merit in such a case. We pray you reject not our prayer.' The prince replied: 'The government of a country is a responsible office, and ever attended with difficulties. The duties of a prince require previous consideration. As for myself, I am indeed of small eminence, but as my father and brother are no more, to reject the heritage of the crown—that can bring no bene-

* Dr. Rhys Davids' *Buddhist India*, p. 19.

fit to the people. I must attend to the opinion of the world, and forget my own insufficiency.' "*

A careful survey of the different stages of Indo-Aryan civilisation in Ancient India will convince all impartial readers that *vox populi* was an important factor which had to be reckoned with as much in political as in social affairs. The spirit of democracy pervaded all important concerns of life. But there was a serious defect in the social machinery which prevented the welding of the scattered masses and the discordant elements into a

* In this connection, it would be interesting to read the following extracts from the *Ramayana*, showing the right of the Councils of Mantris and Amatyas to select a successor to the Throne in the event of the king dying childless or without any heir. King Dasaratha having died,—Rama and Lakshmana also having gone to the forest, and Bharata and Satrughna living far away in Rajgriha, there was none left at Ayodhya to sit on the Throne. The Ministers Kasyapa, Vamadeva, Javali and others assembled together, and addressing the Prime Minister and priest, Vasishtha, pointed out to him the horrors of anarchy and the necessity of appointing a king, saying: "Do you select some one this very day from the descendants of Ikshwaku, to be king here. Verily doth a kingdom go to ruin, when without a king." Hearing their words, Vasishtha said unto the Brahmans, and the adherents and counsellors (of the late king): "Bharata, on whom the King has conferred the kingdom, along with his brother, Satrughna, is living happily in the house of his maternal uncle. Let envoys by means of fleet coursers speedily repair thither and bring those heroic brothers. What shall we decide?" "Let them go," said all unto Vasishtha. * * * Bharata, accompanied by Satrughna, came back to Ayodhya, and lamented over the death of his father and the exile of his brothers. After the performance of the last rites of the King, on the morning of the fourteenth day, the ministers of the King assembled, addressed Bharata in the following words: "Having exiled his eldest son and the exceedingly strong Lakshmana, Dasaratha has gone to heaven. Do thou, therefore, O illustrious prince, become our King. Having been permitted by the King, thou wilt commit no fault (by doing so), as the kingdom is without a master. O Raghava, having procured all these necessaries for the installation, the counsellors and others as well as the citizens wait, O King's son. Do thou, O foremost of men, have thyself sprinkled, and rule over us." Thereupon Bharata replied: "In our line, it is ever fit for the first-born alone to perform the task of the government. It doth not behove ye, who are wise, to say so unto me. Certainly Rama, our eldest brother, shall become the king, and I will abide in the forest for five and nine years." *Ramayana*, Bk. II, secs. 97, 68, 79.

homogeneous whole, and which, in course of time, led to the deterioration of the Indo-Aryan race. The firm establishment of British rule in India, and the spread of Western culture among the people, have done much to draw them close together, and produce a feeling of unity among them. This feeling has to be carefully nursed, fostered and strengthened, by doing away with all pernicious systems and customs that obstruct its free play and growth. The spirit of democracy is ingrained in the very nature of the Indians, but it requires to be emancipated from the bondages imposed upon it, mostly by the people themselves. The political regeneration of the Indians, therefore, depends greatly on the successful carrying out of social and religious reforms.

ABINAS CHANDRA DAS.
M. R., April, 1908.

INDIA'S CAPACITY TO RULE HERSELF

That sincere and well-informed friend of India, the Rev. Dr. J. T. Sunderland of America, has contributed an excellent article on "The Nationalist Movement in India" to a recent number of *The Atlantic Monthly*. Regarding India's capacity to govern herself, he says :—

"The truth is, not one single fact can be cited that goes to show that India cannot govern herself—reasonably well at first, excellently well later—if only given a chance. It would not be difficult to form an Indian Parliament to-day, composed of men as able and of as high character as those that constitute the not less able National Parliament of China when the new Constitutional Government of that nation comes into operation. This is only another way of saying that among the leaders in the various States and Provinces of India there is abundance of material to form an Indian National Parliament not inferior in intellectual ability or in moral worth to the Parliaments of the Western world."

Seeing that such is the case, one may well ask, why if power goes by capacity and if we possess the capacity for self-rule, we do not get it ? The reason is obvious, and may be made clear by an illustration. A river can under normal circumstances easily reach its goal, the Ocean, if it has sufficient water to flow in a stream. But suppose its path is obstructed by a land-slip or by an upheaval of a part of its bed or by an artificial dam built across it from bank to bank. Evidently then its waters must accumulate till they can either exert sufficient pressure to break through the obstruction, or rise so high as to overtop and flow over the obstruction. Such has been the case with the stream of our national life. The capacity that we possess would under ordinary circumstances suffice to carry us on to our goal of perfect citizenship. But there is the obstruction caused by the foreign bureaucracy and exploiters. We hope it would not be sedition to say, as Lord Morley did in the House of Lords on March 4, 1909, that "it was the bureaucratic system that" we wanted "to make a breach in." We prefer to remain on the safe side and say that our national life can certainly rise above the obstruction imposed by bureaucrats and exploiters. That is an arduous task, but we must attempt it, and are sure to succeed if we have sufficient determination and organisation. Many a Hindu pilgrim desires to visit Mount Kailas beyond the Himalayas. There is no one so foolish as to try to reach that sacred shrine by making a level road by blowing up the Himalayas with explosives. No, the determined pilgrims simply trudge along the high snow-covered and storm-swept mountain passes. The Kailas of our national life can be reached by literally surmounting, climbing over the top of the obstructions. It is futile to attempt to blow them up with explosives. Eager pilgrim, if you have no faith in your power to ascend high enough, if the chill blasts, the blinding snowstorms, the avalanches and the other thousand unknown dangers of the mountain-tops daunt you,

give up the cherished hope of reaching Kailas. But we do hope you are not such a lotus-eating poltroon and in that hope bid you God-speed.

M. R., April, 1909.

THE IDEA OF NATIONALITY INDIAN IN ORIGIN

Sir Herbert Risley made a speech on India at the annual banquet of the Royal Asiatic Society held in London May, 1910, last. Quoting Sir Henry Maine he said that the idea of nationality was first derived from India; it travelled westwards; now it is travelling back to the East growing and spreading, but, he added, without the root of experience. Anglo-Indians had hitherto denied that we ever had any idea of nationality. So this admission means something. As for "the root of experience," we deny that we have none, though it can grow equal to that of the most advanced self-ruling nations only by our becoming a fully developed nation.

M. R., July, 1910.

NOTES ON SELF-RULE IN THE EAST

Self-Rule in Turkey.

Many persons unacquainted with the real political condition of Turkey previous to the present consti-

tutional *regime*, consider it very surprising that a country governed so despotically all along should have so suddenly become a limited monarchy with a parliamentary constitution. But the government of Turkey was not so despotic as it has often been described to be. Mr. Grattan Geary, a very well known Anglo-Indian, who travelled in Turkey about 30 years ago, thus wrote of the Turkish Government in his work on Turkey:—

"People do not complain," he said, "of the tyranny of the government; its laxity and inefficiency, and the inertness and venality of the subordinate officials are the most frequent topics when grumbling begins......Among themselves they canvass every official act with the greatest freedom, for there is no organized espionage to make them afraid. The Turks have no Siberia.

"*The Turks are much more fitted for Parliamentary institutions than many nations which flatter themselves that they are much further advanced in civilisation. One reason for this is, that there has been always a large measure of local self-government throughout the Empire*............The experiment of a Turkish Parliament was by no means absurd in itself, though it appeared so to Europeans who had no means of becoming acquainted with the real tendency of things in the Ottoman Empire, and knew nothing of the existence of a certain measure of self-government in all its provinces." [The italics are ours.]

Self-Government in Afghanistan.

The Afghans have always possessed self-government in a form which it has been difficult to stamp out. They are the Highlanders of Asia and their tribal *jirgahs* are really so many Parliamentary institutions to manage their domestic and foreign affairs. These *jirgahs* are representative bodies. It is because the Afghans have been brought up under self-rule for centuries, that they so strongly resent the interference of foreigners in their affairs. Self-rule in their country has already been described in detail in a previous paper by means of extracts from Elphinstone's "Account of the Kingdom of Caubul" (2nd Edition).

The religion of Islam, in its origin, in its development and in its progress, has been saturated through and through with the spirit of democracy. Wherever it has found its home, it has favoured the doctrine,

if not of the brotherhood of man, at least of the brotherhood of the members of its own creed. So democracy is quite suited to the countries which believe that God is One and Mahomed was His Prophet.

This is not mere speculation. It was true in the best days of the Caliphate, as Shaikh M. H. Kidwai shows in the following paragraph taken from a letter which he wrote to the London *Daily News* on June 16, 1910, in reply to Mr. Balfour's unfounded assertion that Orientals have never shown any capacity for self-government.

"In reply to these assertions, I challenge him to show me any other period in the history of the world when the equality of man to man of every colour and race was more practically established, when the government of a country—an Empire—was on a more popular basis and with less autocracy, bureaucracy, or officialism or absolutism than the glorious Khalifat of Omar. It was real Self-government, in the strictest sense of the term, as even a sweeper had a voice and a hand in the administration of his Empire. It is in fact the only period in the history of the world known to us when true socialistic principles were tried in the administration of an Empire and in the regulation of a harmonious and gradeless society which extended over countries and continents."

Republics in Ancient India.

That republics existed in ancient India is clear from the following extract from an article on oriental research in the *Times of India* by Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar, who is not a political agitator :—

"The Indian Aryans had, like their European brethren, the rudiments of free political institutions. When Kshatriya tribes settled in a province, the name of the tribe in the place became the name of the province, and the Panchalas, Angas, Vangas, Vrijis, etc., collectively became identified with the countries in which they lived. And actually the existence of aristocratic republics is alluded to in Buddhist Pali books......Why did the instinct of political freedom and a passion for national unity not grow in India while they did among the Aryan races of Europe? Probably the cause is to be sought in the rigidly despotic and tyrannical manner in which the conquering Aryas treated the subject races. *One section of a community, especially if it be small, cannot continue to enjoy freedom if it rigidly denies it to the other and larger section*, and cannot have the desire to be united with it by the national tie if it invariably despises the other as an inferior race, and denies it the ordinary rights of man."

Incidentally, British Imperialists may be asked to reflect on the sentence we have italicised above.

But it may be said that Dr. Bhandarkar being an Indian may not be an absolutely impartial witness. Dr. Hœrnle, a recognised authority, in the address on Jainism which he delivered in 1898, as President of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, stated that Mahavira, the founder of Jainism, was born in a state which was an oligarchic republic. Said he :—

"Vaisali is the modern Besarh, about 27 miles north of Patna. Anciently it consisted of three distinct portions, called Vaisali, Kundagama and Vaniyagama, and forming in the main, the quarters inhabited by the Brahman, Kshatriya and Baniya castes respectively.......While it existed, it had a curious political constitution ; it was an oligarchic republic ; its government was vested in a Senate, composed of the heads of the resident Kshatriya clans, presided over by an officer who had the title of king and was assisted by a Viceroy and a Commander-in chief."—Dr. Hoernle in the *Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, No. II, February, 1898, p. 40.

We next turn to *The Early History of India* by Mr. Vincent Smith (Second Edition, 1908).

"The settled country between the Himalaya mountains and the Narmada river was divided into a multitude of independent states, some monarchies, and some tribal republics, owing no allegiance to any paramount power, secluded from the outer world and free to fight among themselves." P. 25.

"Alexander selected as the adversaries worthy of his steel the more important confederacy of independent tribes which was headed by the Kathaioi, who dwelt upon the left or eastern side of the Hydraotes, and enjoyed the highest reputation for skill in the art of war." P. 67.

"The enumeration by the courtly panegyrist of the frontier kingdoms and republics whose rulers did homage and paid tribute to the Emperor, a title fairly earned by Samudragupta (326-315 A. D.), enables the historians to define the boundaries of his dominions with sufficient accuracy, and to realise the nature of the political divisions of India in the fourth century." P. 270.

"The Punjab, Eastern Rajputana, and Malwa for the most part were in possession of tribes or clans living under republican institutions. The Yaudheya tribe occupied both banks of the Sutlej, while the Madrakas held the central parts of the Punjab. The reader may remember that in Alexander's time these regions were similarly occupied by autonomous tribes, then called the Malloi, Kathaioi, and so forth....... The Arjunayana, Malavas, and Abhiras were settled in Eastern Rajputana and Malwa, and in this direction the river Chambal may be regarded as the imperial boundary." P. 271,

We now come to another European orientalist and historian whose claim to speak with authority no one will venture to dispute. We mean Mr. T. W. Rhys Davids, LL.D., Ph.D. We give below some extracts from his *Buddhist India*.

"When Buddhism arose there was no paramount sovereign in India. The kingly power was not, of course, unknown. There had been kings in the valley of the Ganges for centuries, long before Buddhism, and the time was fast approaching when the whole of India would be under the sway of monarchical governments. In those parts of India which came very early under the influence of Buddhism, we find, besides a still surviving number of small aristocratic republics, four kingdoms of considerable extent and power............And the tendency towards the gradual absorption of these domains, and also of the republics, into the neighbouring kingdoms, was already in full force. The evidence at present available is not sufficient to give us an exact idea either of the extent of country or of the number of population, under the one or the other form of government ; nor has any attempt been so far made to trace the history of political institutions in India before the rise of Buddhism. We can do no more, then, than state the fact—most interesting from the comparative point of view—that the earliest Buddhist records reveal the survival, side by side with more or less powerful monarchies, of republics with either complete or modified independence.

"It is significant that this important factor in the social condition of India in the sixth and seventh centuries B.C. has remained hitherto unnoticed by scholars either in Europe or in India. They have relied for their information about the Indian peoples too exclusively on the Brahmin books and these, partly because of the natural antipathy felt by the priests towards the free republics, partly because of the later date* of most of the extant priestly literature. and especially of the law books, ignore the real facts. They convey the impression that the only recognised, and in fact universally prevalent, form of government was that of kings under the guidance and tutelage of priests. But the Buddhist records, amply confirmed in these respects by the somewhat later Jain ones, leave no doubt upon the point." Pp. 1-2.

We draw the reader's attention to the reason, given by Mr. Rhys Davids in the foregoing paragraph, why the opinion still prevails that ancient India knew no other form of government than absolute monarchy.

* Cf. "Professor Bhandarkar's recent views as to the wholesale recasting of Brahmin literature in the Gupta period." *Buddhist India*, p. 32.

"The administrative and judicial business of the (Sakiya) clan was carried out in public assembly, at which young and old were alike present, in their common Mote Hall (*Santhagara*) at Kapilavastu. It was at such a parliament or palaver, that King Pasenadi's proposition was discussed. When Ambattha goes to Kapilavastu on business, he goes to the Mote Hall where the Sakiyas were then in session. And it is to the Mote Hall of the Mallas that Ananda goes to announce the death of Buddha, they being then in session there to consider that very matter.

"A single chief—how, and for what period chosen, we do not know—was elected as office-holder, presiding over the sessions, and if no sessions were sitting, over the State. He bore the title of *raja*, which must have meant something like the Roman Consul, or the Greek Archon. We hear nowhere of such a triumvirate as bore corresponding office among the Lichchavis, nor of such acts of kingly sovereignty as are ascribed to the real kings mentioned above. But we hear at one time that Bhaddiya, a young cousin of Buddha's, was the raja, and in another passage, Suddhodana, the Buddha's father (who is elsewhere spoken of as a simple citizen, Suddhodana the Sakiyan) is called the raja.

"A new Mote Hall, built at Kapilavastu, was finished whilst the Buddha was staying at the Nigrodharama (the pleasance under the Banyan Grove) in the Great Wood (the Mahavana) near by. There was a residence there, provided by the community, for recluses of all schools. Gotama was asked to inaugurate the new hall, and he did so by a series of ethical discourses lasting through the night delivered by himself, Ananda, and Moggallana.

"Besides this Mote Hall at the principal town we hear of others at some of the other towns above referred to. And no doubt all the more important places had such a hall, or pavilion, covered with a roof, but with no walls, in which to conduct their business. And the local affairs of each village were carried on in open assembly of the householders, held in the groves which, then as now, formed so distinctive a feature of each village in the long and level alluvial plain." P. 19-20.

"This jungle (Mahavana) was infested from time to time by robbers, sometimes runaway slaves. But we hear of no crime, and there was not probably very much, in the villages themselves —each of them a tiny self-governed republic." Pp. 21.

"A late tradition tells us how the criminal law was administered in the adjoining powerful confederate clan of the Vajjians, by a succession of regularly appointed officers,—"justices, lawyers, rehearsers of the law maxims, the council of the representatives of the eight clans, the general, the vice-consul, and the consul himself." P. 22.

"There are several other names of tribes of which it is not yet known whether they were clans or under monarchical government. We have only one instance of any tribe, once under a monarchy, reverting to the independent state." P. 23.

The foregoing paragraph shows that revolutions leading to the declaration of independence by a tribe and the establishment of a republic were not unknown in ancient India. The paragraph printed below proves the same thing :—

"It is very interesting to notice that while tradition makes Videha a kingdom in earlier times, it describes it in the Buddha's time as a republic." P. 26.

"It (Vesali) was the only great city in all the territories of the free clans who formed so important a factor in the social and political life of the sixth century. It must have been a great and flourishing place." P. 41.

"Alexander found a succession of small kingdoms and republics, whose mutual jealousies more than counterbalanced the striking bravery of their forces and enabled him to attack and defeat them one by one." P. 268.

The extracts from various authors given above show that republics existed in India, that they existed at least as early as the days of Buddha and Mahavira (sixth century B.C.) and as late as the reign of Samudragupta (fourth century A.D.) and that they were situated in the extensive tract of country stretching from the Panjab to Bihar and from Nepal to the southern borders of the Central Provinces. So the republican form of government in ancient India had a duration of at least one thousand years. We do not know of any other country, ancient or modern, where democracy has prevailed for a longer period. In ancient Italy the republic of Rome lasted for five hundred years. In ancient Greece the republic of Athens lasted for a little more than three hundred years. And these countries, which in ancient times were dotted over with small republics, are certainly not as extensive as the parts of India which in olden days could boast of many republics. As for achievements, the history of these Indian republics is too little known to enable us to say anything positive on the subject. But we suppose the fact that they gave to the world a Buddha and a Mahavira will not even in these jingo and materialistic days be considered unworthy of being blazened in letters of gold in the pages of history.

SELF-GOVERNMENT IN INDIA.

There are many "authorities" possessed of extensive ignorance of ancient and modern India who hold that Indians have never been a self-governing people. We have always held a contrary opinion and stated the facts on which our opinion is based in many articles and notes. We add a few more.

The late Dr. Leitner wrote:—

"Above all would I venture to draw your attention to a consideration of the circumstances which serve to prove that the constitution of the native society in India is emphatically autonomous and republican (whether aristocratic as with the Hindus or democratic, as with the Sikhs and Sunni Muhammadans), and that this autonomy has ever been respected under the most despotic governments that preceded the advent of British power."

"There is, indeed, scarcely a domain of human knowledge in which we cannot learn as much from, as we can impart to, 'the East.' The careful study of the caste-system of India will suggest thoughts that may throw light on problems in the solution of which we are still engaged in Europe. The more we know of the politics of Muhammadanism, Hinduism and Sikhism, the better must we be able to co-operate with our fellow-subjects of those faiths in measures of public utility and in the administration of India. Certainly, in education, they ensure its dissemination more by treating piety and knowledge as one and indivisible, than by the dualism which threatens to dissociate religion from science in Europe,......" (Indigenous Elements of Self-Government in India; Introduction, pp. v. and vi.)

"The Republican, if aristocratic, instincts of the province (Punjab) are subdued under a practically irresponsible bureaucracy of aliens in measures, feelings, interest and knowledge, although ennobled by good intentions. For say what one may, the traditions which have maintained Indian society for thousands of years, are Republican. If its fabric, shaken to its foundation, is to be consolidated in a manner worthy of British rule it must be by the spread of Republican institutions. That these are not a novelty may be shown by a brief reference to the three great communities that inhabit the Punjab.

"I.—THE SIKHS

from whom we took over the responsiblities of rule,....... All their affairs, secular and spiritual,...... were regulated at the four great 'Takhts'—literally Boards, Platforms, or Thrones—of Akhalghar, Anandpur, Patna, and Abchalnagar, where every Sikh, great or small, had a voice, for did not Guru Govind himself, after investing four disciples with 'pahal,' stand in a humble attitude before them to be invested in his turn? Again, whenever Sikhs meet in the guru's name there is the *fifth* Takht, and it is

not long ago that at one of them the idolatrous practices, justified by the Durbar of Amritsar, were condemned by the consent of the faithful assembled at Akhalghar,...... Men and women, clergy and laity, of sacred and profane descent, all, is merged in the one standing of '*Sikh*',—learner or disciple.

"II.—THE MUHAMMADANS

in so far as they are Sunnis and people of the congregation (Ahljamas'at), have no *raison d'etre* if they do not acknowledge the elective principle in political matters, the ground on which they separated from the adherents of the hereditary principle, the Shiahs. Indeed with the latter the Sovereign has sunk below the priesthood, whilst with the former the greatest ruler is only acknowledged if he rules theocratically. The experience of their institutions, the absence of class or caste in pure Muhammadanism, and the partial success of the "Umuma" Turkish Parliament, so long as it lasted, not to speak of the Council of all races of the revered Al-Ma'mun and other Khalifas, the autonomy of every race and creed under Turkish rule, are the examples, if not proofs, to be held out for *our* encouragement in the noble task which the Government has undertaken, if not for the guidance of our Muhammadan fellow-citizens.

"III.—THE HINDUS

are an agglomeration of innumerable commonwealths, each governed by its own social and religious laws. Each race, tribe and caste, cluster of families and family, is a republic in confederation with other republics, as the United States of Hinduism, each jealous of its prerogatives, but each a part of a great autonomy with Panchayets in every trade, village, caste, and subsection of caste invested with judicial, social, commercial, and even sumptuary authority discussed in their own public meetings. What did it matter who the tyrant was that temporarily obscured their horizon and took from them the surplus earnings which his death was sure to restore to the country? Even now, if the bulk of the lower castes did not settle their differences at the Councils of their Boards, and if the respectable and conservative classes did not shrink from attendance at Courts of Justice, we might increase the area of litigation a hundredfold and yet not do a tenth of the work that is still done by the arbitration of the 'Brotherhoods.' [Do. pp. 1—3]."

Dr. Leitner speaks above of the Hindus as an agglomeration of social republics. We have shown that republics, in the political sense, too, existed in ancient India for at least a thousand years.

ARE ORIENTALS FIT FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT?

In June or July, 1908, Mr. Ratanshaw Koyasji, B.A., LL.B., solicitor, of Blantyre, Nyasaland, con-

tributed a telling letter to *India* on the above subject and quoted the following words of the late Mr. Anstey:—

"We are apt to forget when we talk of preparing people in the East by education, and all that sort of thing, for Municipal government and Parliamentary government, that the East is the parent of municipalities. Local self-government, in the widest acceptation of the term, is as old as the East itself. No matter what portion of that continent is considered, there is not a portion of Asia, from West to East, from North to South, which is not swarming with municipalities; and not only so, but like to our municipalities of old, they are well bound together as in a species of net-work, so that you have ready-made to your hand the frame-work of a great system of representation, and all you have to do is to adopt what you have there.

......Take the case of China. I happened to be called upon to prepare a scheme of police administration for that portion of China which has fallen into our dominions. What did I do? Did I go to Germany, or the United States, or England in quest of models? No, I looked across to Canton: they had the tithing the hundred, the shire, the province and the kingdom. I adopted that system, and that is the system by which, I believe, that part of our dominions is governed at this day. Take Bengal; open that most admirable of all collections of State papers, the celebrated Fifth Report of the Committee of 1811, and read there if you wish to know of what mighty thing the municial system of India is capable....Now let me go to what I call political representative government on a large scale. Can any man who has in his memory the marvellous history of the Sikh Commonwealth tell me that the natives of India are incapable not only of sending delegates to a Council sitting in Calcutta or Bombay or Madras or Agra, but if the emergency required it, of governing themselves? What was the case of the Sikh Commonwealth? Who were the Sikhs when their prophet first found them out? Poor miserable starvelings from Bengal, of whom their great founder, knowing well the stuff of which Asiatics were made, looking with a prophetic eye into the future, said, 'I will teach the sparrow to strike the eagle.' In comparison with the great dynasty of Aurangzib, it was the sparrow as compared to the eagle, and in less than a century the sparrow did strike the eagle......We ought to profit by the moral and we ought to believe that those poor Bengalees who in three generations (for it only required three generations to effect that marvellous change) were able to found a Commonwealth may be reasonably considered to be fit to exercise the much less exalted function of meeting, village by village, taluq by taluq, and there, electing in their own quiet way, some spokesman on their behalf to go and confer with the Sircar. For that is the meaning of representative government.

"Let us not be frightened by that bugbear incapacity; there is no nation unfit for free institutions. If you wait for absolute per-

fection, the world will come to an end before you have established your free institutions; but you must take the world as it is, and there is no nation so ignorant but knows its wants; or some of its pressing wants; there is no nation so poor, but it has some proprietary or possessory interests for the perfection of which it is solicitous; and there is no nation which is not entitled, therefore, with a view to its own wants, or what it conceives to be its wants and interests, to be heard in its own defence."

SELF-GOVERNMENT IN INDIA IN THE PRE-BRITISH PERIOD.

Mr. R. H. Elliot wrote in *Fraser's Magazine* for April, 1872:

"In former times there existed in India reigning powers that lived on the resources of the people; but though these powers levied taxes and waged war on each other at pleasure, the internal management of affairs was left to the village communities, and the people had the power of modifying their customs in accordance with what seemed to them to be expedient. Now this power we have entirely taken away from them; and not only have we done this, but we thrust our meddling noses into all the details of life, and refine here and reform there, and always, it must be remembered, with increased and unceasing taxation. It still, however, remains to explain how we have deprived them of the power of modifying their customs: and this has been done simply by seizing on the existing customs as we found them, writing them down, and turning them into laws which the people have no power to alter in any way. And, to make matters as bad as they can be, where we have found gaps we have filled them up with a kind of law-stucco of express rules taken very much at haphazard from English law books. The old rights of communities of Hindoos have thus been entirely absorbed by our Government, which has now deprived the people of every particle of civic power....... We thus see, as was very clearly pointed out in Maine's *Village Communities* only the other day, that if the people have gained some benefits from us they have also lost others; and we need hardly add that the results of this entire deprivation of free action are altogether deadly and destructive to the very existence of the most valuable powers of man."

VILLAGE GOVERNMENT IN ANCIENT INDIA.

That in ancient times many parts of India possessed free and representative institutions has been proved in our last number. Elphinstone says in his *Account of the Kingdom of Caubul*:—

"There are traces in the village government of India, of the existence of a system resembling that of the Afghaun Ooloosses; the remains of it, which have survived a long course of oppres-

sion, still afford some relief from the disorders of the government, and supply the solution of a difficulty, which must be experienced by all travellers in the centre of India, respecting the flourishing state of parts of the country, from which all government appears to be withdrawn." Vol. I, p. 284

So it is clear that these village republics were so strong and so firmly rooted in the soil that even in the midst of anarchy they were prosperous. But it is not our ancient village communities alone that show that we have the instinct of self-government. Our caste brotherhoods are democratic institutions, and our joint families are democratically conducted. Some people might be disposed to consider it a long leap from domestic government to the government of a State. But, as Tacitus says, "Domestic rule is more difficult than the government of a kingdom." And it is not unreasonab'e to think that the government of the home fits persons for the government of larger aggregations of individuals. For a family is the state in miniature, and in it all the functions of the government have to be exercised by its head : he has to be judge, jury, treasurer, law-maker, etc., in the harmonious management of the household and the orderly bringing up of the children.

Ancient village Associations in Southern India.

It was not in Northern India alone that local self-government existed, but they were a feature of Southern India, too, as the following extracts from Vincent Smith's *Early History of India* will show :—

"The records published by him [the late Mr. Sundaram Pillai] show that at the beginning of the twelfth century Travancore, or Southern Kerala, formed part of the Chola empire of Rajendra Chola-Kulottunga, and to all appearance was well governed and administered. The details of the working of the ancient village associations or assemblies are especially interesting, and prove that the government was by no means a mere centralized autocracy. The village assemblies possessed considerable administrative and judicial powers, exercised under the supervision of the crown officials." Pp. 413-414.

"Certain long inscriptions of Parantaka I [a Chola King, 907

A.D.] are of especial interest to the students of village institutions by reason of the full details which they give of the manner in which local affairs were administered by well-organized local committees, or panchayats, exercising their extensive administrative and judicial powers under royal sanction. It is a pity that this apparently excellent system of local self-government, really popular in origin, should have died out ages ago. Modern governments would be happier if they could command equally effective local agency. The subject has been studied carefully by two native scholars, whose disquisitions are well worth reading. Whenever the mediaeval history of Southern India comes to be treated in detail, a long and interesting chapter must be devoted to the methods of Chola administration.*" Pp. 414-419.

MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION IN ANCIENT INDIA.

The following extract from Vincent Smith's *Early History of India* will show the nature of municipal administration in the days of Chandra Gupta :—

"The details recorded concerning the civil administration of Chandra Gupta's empire, if not so copious as we might desire, are yet sufficient to enable us to realize the system of government; which although, of course, based upon the personal autocracy of the sovereign, was something better than a merely arbitrary tyranny.

"The administration of the capital city, Pataliputra, was provided for by the formation of a municipal commission consisting of thirty members, divided, like the war office commission of equal members, into six Boards or Committees of five members each. These Boards may be regarded as an official development of the ordinary non-official *panchayet*, or committee of five members, by which every caste and trade in India has been accustomed to regulate its internal affairs from time immemorial." Pp. 124-125."

M. R., August and September, 1910.

INDIAN UNITY

A certain school of British writers would deny to India, ancient or modern, any unity except that which belongs to her at present by virtue of being

* S. Krishnaswami Iyengar, 'The Chola Administration, 900—1300 A.D. (*Madras Review*, 1903); V. Venkayya, 'Irrigation in Southern India' in 'Ancient Times' (*Archœlo. Survey* Annual Rep., 1903-4, pp, 203—211).

under the same government. They would do well to read the following extracts from Vincent Smith's *Early History of India* :—

"India, encircled as she is by seas and mountains, is indisputably a geographical unit, and, as such, is rightly designated by one name. Her type of civilization, too, has many features which differentiate it from that of all other regions of the world, while they are common to the whole country, or rather continent, in a degree sufficient to justify its treatment as a unit in the history of human, social, and intellectual development.

"But the complete political unity of India under the control of a paramount power, wielding unquestioned authority, is a thing of yesterday, barely a century old. The most notable of her rulers in the olden time cherished the ambition of universal Indian dominion, and severally attained it in a greater or less degree. But not one of them attained it completely, and this failure implies a lack of unity in political history which renders the task of the historian difficult.

"The same difficulty besets the historian of Greece still more pressingly ; but in that case, with the attainment of unity, the interest of the history vanishes." P. 5.

"Twice in the long series of centuries dealt with in this history, the political unity of all India was nearly attained ; first, in the third century, B. C., when Asoka's empire extended almost to the latitude of Madras ; and again, in the fourth century A. D., when Samudragupta carried his victorious arms from the Ganges to the borders of the Tamil country. Other princes, although their conquests were less extensive, yet succeeded in establishing, and for a time maintaining, empires which might fairly claim to rank as paramount powers." P. 6.

M. R., September, 1910.

DEMOCRACY IN ISLAM

In an article contributed to *Muslim India and Islamic Review* Prof. Feroz-ud-Din of Aligarh College quotes the following words of Caliph Umar :

"My Brothers ! I owe you several duties, and you have several rights over me. One of them is that you should see that I do not misuse the revenues;

another, that I may not adopt wrong measures in the assessment of the revenue; that I should increase your salaries; protect the frontiers; and that I should not involve you in unnecessary dangers. Whenever I err, you have a right to stop and to take me to task."

And observes: "That the great Caliph during his whole regime kept these words to their very spirit is above every criticism. His own well-known saying, "There is no Caliphate without the consultation of the general body of Musalmans," characterised all his career as a ruler. The emoluments of his office were just sufficient to enable him to keep body and soul together, and to cover his body with a shirt of of rough, coarse cloth, with twelve patches in it; in fact, the total daily expenses of his household did not amount to more than a shilling. In the beginning he did not take anything from the Bait-ul-Mal (Treasury), but later on he found that the duties of his office were interfered with by his private efforts to earn a livelihood for himself. He then put the question of his stipend in the hands of the "Majlis-i-Shura" (the representative body of Councillors), as well as before the Musalmans at large, congregated in the mosque for the Friday prayers, and it was decided that he should be given just as much as he required for his ordinary needs."

M. R., July, 1913.

POLITICAL EVOLUTION WITH A VENGEANCE

A local Anglo-Indian contemporary has in effect laid down the comfortable principle that as Englishmen took a thousand years to obtain their present

civic rights, Indians cannot now, after (only !) a century and a half of British rule, hope to have much more of self-government than has been promised in the Government of India's resolution on its local self-government policy. We cannot but admire our contemporary's firm grasp of the principles of political evolution. We hope it will elaborate and preach a consistent theory of evolution in all departments of human education and progress.

For instance, if a savage tribe has to be taught the manufacture and use of weapons and tools, it should be made to pass through the palaeolithic, neolithic and bronze ages, and the ages of bone weapons and implements, before it is initiated into the mysteries of making steel and steel weapons and tools. If a people have to be taught to manufacture and use steam engines, they should at first be taught to make Hero's apparatus (130 B.C.), then, after 18 centuries, Savery's pumping engine (1698 A.D.), then Newcomen's atmospheric engine (1705 A.D.), then, after half a century, Watt's apparatus (1763 A.D.), and so on. If children are to be taught chemistry, they should first become alchemists ; then, many centuries later, after several re-incarnations, they should have Roscoe or some other modern chemist as their preceptor.

Coming to political education, the American Negroes should not have been given the franchise all at once. They should have been given some political institution, more primitive than the Anglo-Saxon witenagemot, to experiment with. After several centuries of struggle and experience, they should have got something like Simon de Montfort's parliament. And after a thousand years' political training they might have qualified for the American franchise.

Similarly, when half a century ago the Japanese wanted a constitutional form of government, they ought by no means to have adopted a more modern system than that which existed in the days of Alfred the Great. After 10 or 12 centuries they might have aspired to have something like the modern British

Parliament or the modern German Reichstag. But they were very foolish and very ambitious. So they all at once tried to combine the good features of the modern British, German and American forms of representative government. They have now had some sort of constitutional government for half a century: and it is very sad that they have not totally failed, even to please some Anglo-Indian journalists and bureaucrats.

The greatest *un*-evolutionary mistake made has been the granting of responsible self-rule to the Philippines by America within less than two decades after its conquest by the Yankees. What a pity that they did not consult our Anglo-Indian expert in political evolution!

The practical acquaintance of the Indian people with representative institutions is neither more superficial nor of shorter duration than that of the American Negroes, or of the Japanese before the sixties of the last century, or of the Filipinos. We hope we are not the most dull and incompetent people on earth. Then why should we not claim to have a large fraction of the civic rights which the Japanese, the Filipinos and the American Negroes successfully exercise?

Even a tyro of the theory of human evolution knows that the human embryo, successively assumes in its mother's womb shapes like those of many lower animals. It repeats in its life the process of evolution as it were. But in its case the whole process takes only months, where the actual process of the evolution of different species of animals took æons. Similarly, in political evolution, where one nation took a thousand years to perfect its constitution, another nation can so profit by its example that it can learn in a decade what the former took many centuries to evolve. The improvement of the human race would have been impossible if every people had to repeat in its own life the whole tedious process of civilization in each of its aspects.

M. R., June, 1915.

JQ
218
C5

Chatterjee, Ramananda
Towards home rule

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 11 04 06 02 004 2